THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

Parl. Papers.

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

619885

HANSARD'S
PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES:

FORMING A CONTINUATION OF

"THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY OF ENGLAND,
FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE
YEAR 1803."

Third Series;

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF WILLIAM IV.

VOL. XII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM
THE NINTH DAY OF APRIL,
TO
THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF MAY, 1832.

Fourth Volume of the Session.

LONDON:

Printed by T. C. HANSARD, *Pater-noster-Row,*

FOR BALDWIN AND CRADOCK; J. BOOKER; LONGMAN, REES, ORME, AND CO.;
J. M. RICHARDSON; PARBURY, ALLEN, AND CO.; J. HATCHARD AND SON;
J. RIDGWAY; E. JEFFERY AND SON; J. RODWELL; CALKIN AND BUDD;
R. H. EVANS; J. BOOTH; AND T. C. HANSARD.

1832.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_april-may-1832_12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME XII,

THIRD SERIES.

I. Subjects of Debate in the House of Lords.
II. Subjects of Debate in the House of Commons.
III. Lists of Divisions in both Houses.
IV. Protests.

◆

I. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

1832. *Page*
April 9. Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second Reading—First Day—Duke of Buckingham's Plan of Reform—Debate adjourned 1
10. Borough of Arundel—Petition objecting to the Incorporation of Little Hampton—Personal Recrimination 106
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second Reading—Second Day—Debate Adjourned 122
11. Reform—Petitions 211
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second reading—Third Day—Debate again Adjourned—Discussion as to fixing the Day for the Committee 213
13. Education (Ireland)—Petition relative to the Ministerial Plan 323
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second Reading—Adjourned Debate—Fourth Day—Divisions, &c. 327
16. Education (Ireland)—Petitions against the Ministerial Plan .. 496
Affray at Newtownbarry—Captain Graham—Motion for Papers to illustrate the Proceedings in relation to the Conduct of the Government to Captain Graham in that Affray 499
17. West-India Interest—Petition—Motion for appointing a Committtee 596
Arrears of Tithes (Ireland)—Bill read a First Time 631

1832. Page

May 7. Reform—London and Edinburgh Petitions 669

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—First Day—Lord Lyndhurst's Amendment agreed to—Divisions, &c. 676

8. Arrears of Tithes (Ireland)—Postponement of the measure in consequence of the Resignation of the Ministers—Explanation by the Archbishop of Armagh 745

9. Resignation of Ministers—Announcement by Earl Grey that the Ministers had resigned their Offices because his Majesty did not think proper to follow their advice 758

Reform—Birmingham Petition—Similar brief statement by the Lord Chancellor 760

Reform—Committee—Motion to discharge the Order for the Committee—Attack on the Conduct of the Administration by the Earl of Carnarvon—His Motion for appointing another Day for the Committee 762

11. Reform—Petitions—Character and Numbers of different Meetings to support Reform 868

14. The New Ministry—Declaration that one was forming, and Postponement of the Reform Bill 905

15. Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland)—Petitions 980

Ministerial Appointments—Probability that Earl Grey would continue to hold Office 982

17. Ministerial Arrangements—Explanation of the Duke of Wellington and Lord Lyndhurst—Earl Grey like to keep Office and pass the Reform Bill 993

18. Ministerial Arrangements—Explanation by the Archbishop of York—Announcement by Earl Grey that he is to remain in Office—Declaration by various noble Peers of the Conduct they mean to pursue under such circumstance 1043

21. Stockton-on-Tees—Petition for a Member 1094

Creation of Peers—Question as to the Authenticity of a Letter purporting to be a pledge by the King to create Peers .. 1096

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—Second Day—Schedule C—Lord Ellenborough's Plan of Reform—Various Explanations and proposed Amendments—Case of Greenwich and Devonport 1098

22. University of Durham—Bill for establishing such a University Read a Second Time 1209

Creation of Peers—The King's Letter—Motion by the Duke of Newcastle for an Address to his Majesty to obtain a correct Copy of a Letter from the King to Earl Grey—Motion withdrawn 1218

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—Third Day—The Metropolitan Boroughs—Division on the Tower Hamlets—Schedule D. 1220

23. Arrears of Tithes (Ireland)—Bill Committed 1363

1832. Page
Tithes (Ireland)—Petitions—Discussion as to Tithes being Property 1366
Navy Civil Departments Bill—Read a Second Time 1369
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—Fourth Day—Schedule D—Discussion on Dudley and Gateshead—Amendment proposed by Lord Ellenborough to give Six Members to Lancashire—Division—Clauses of the Bill to the 18th agreed to 1375

II. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 9. New System of Education (Ireland)—Petitions 80
Business of the House—System of not allowing a House to be formed 84
Arrears of Tithes (Ireland)—Bill Committed—Amendment—Divisions, &c. 85
Registrar of Deeds (Ireland)—Bill Read a Second Time—Amendments, &c. 96

10. Gravesend Pier—Bill for erecting it—Read a Third time and passed—Amendments .. : 193
Mr. Hutchinson's claims. — Petition from Mr. Hutchinson concerning a Debt due to him from the Rajah of Travancore referred to a Select Committee 195
Exchequer Court (Scotland)—Grant of 2,000*l.* Pension to Mr. Abercromby on retiring from the post of Chief Baron .. 201

11. Durham Gaol—Petition complaining of the Conduct of the Gaoler 303
Post Office—Newspapers—Complaint of Public Officers interfering with the Supply of this Article 304
Maynooth College—Petition against a Grant of Money to that Establishment 306
The Anatomy Bill—Committee—Various Amendments and Divisions 309

13. Education (Ireland)—Petitions against the Ministerial Plan 464
Tithes (Ireland)—Petitions 465
Treaty with France—Question 466
Madeira—Question 466
Supply—Miscellaneous Estimates—Palaces—National Gallery—Professors of Oxford and Cambridge—Penitentiary, &c. 466

16. Education (Ireland)—Petitions—Discussion on the Ministerial Plan 537
Breach of Privilege—Sunderland Harbour—Complaint by Lord Stormont—Printers of a Hand-bill ordered to Attend at the Bar 542
Case of Mr. Curtin—Motion by Mr. Duncombe .. 545
Captures by the Brazilians—Motion for Papers by Mr. Dixon 551
Arrears of Tithes (Ireland) Bill—Third Reading 572

1832. Page
Apr. 18. Tithes (Ireland)—Petition 633
Education (Ireland)—Petition—Conduct of a Public Meeting in the County of Down—Complaint of a House not being made the day before—and of the difficulty of Presenting Petitions 633
Poland—Debate begun by Mr. Cutlar Fergusson on the Motion for the Adjournment for the Easter Holidays .. 636
Anatomy Bill—Committee—Various Amendments .. 664

May 7. Sale of Beer—Petition 733
Education (Ireland)—Petitions from Scotland against the Ministerial Plan 735
Breach of Privilege—The Sunderland Harbour Case—Messrs. Hudson and Wright Admonished and Discharged .. 741
Coroners' Bill—Motion for Committing it—House counted out 744
Courts of Request—Motion by Mr. Hunt for Papers—Law of Debtor and Creditor 752
Pluralities—Church Reform—Motion for Papers—Number of Pluralists 754

9. Resignation of Ministers—Lord Althorp announces the Fact —Notice of Motion for an Address to the Throne, and a Call of the House 770
Presentation of Petitions—Motion for the Appointment of a Committee to devise Regulations on this Subject .. 781

10. Reform—Corporation of London Petition to Stop the Supplies 781
Resignation of Ministers—Lord Ebrington's Motion for an Address to the Crown not to call to his Councils men who will not pass the Reform Bill unimpaired—Division—Lists, &c. 783

11. Reform—Resignation of Ministers—Petitions to Stop the Supplies—Questions put by Mr. Duncombe to Sir Robert Peel 876
Anatomical Science—Bill read a Third Time 894

14. London Petition—Change of Ministry—Acceptance of Office by the Duke of Wellington—Discussion on the Conduct of his Grace in Accepting Office to pass the Reform Bill .. 905

15. Public Feeling—The Ministry—Probability that Earl Grey will remain in Office—Postponement of Business—(Petition) 984
Officers of the Government—Explanation—Recommendation not to allow any to remain in Place who were opposed to the Ministry 990

17. Reform—Stopping the Supplies—Petitions 1032
The Administration—Further Explanations as to the Communication between his Majesty and the Ministers—Explanation as to the Dorsetshire Election 1035

18. Ministerial Arrangements—Lord Althorp announces the Return of Ministers to Office—Explanations by Sir Robert Peel and Others 1071

21. Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland)—Petition .. 1135

1832. Page

May 21. His Majesty's Answer to the Address voted on Lord Ebrington's Motion 1144

Conduct of the Press—Case of the *Satirist*, and other Journals—Question by Lord Stormont—Doctrine of Prosecution for Libel 1144

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for Scotland—Second Reading 1174

Roman Catholic Marriages—Bill postponed 1209

22. Creation of Peers—Stopping the Supplies—Petitions—Explanation by Mr. Tennyson 1274

Navigation Laws and Commercial Policy—Mr. Robinson's Motion 1277

Charter of the Bank of England—Motion for a Select Committee 1356

23. Reform of Parliament (Ireland)—Petitions 1398

Corporation of Cork—Petition 1401

Soap Duties—Petition complaining of the Drawback allowed on Soap exported 1402

Reform—Petitions to pass the Reform Bill unmutilated—Edinburgh Meeting—Conduct of the People—Meeting at Perth—Conduct of the People—Language attributed to Lord Lynedoch 1403

Place of Holding the Norfolk Assizes—Bill for Removing the Assizes from Thetford to Norwich—Read a Second Time 1411

Liverpool Disfranchisement—Bill read a Second Time—Division, &c. 1414

King's County Assizes—Bill for Removing the Place for Holding them from Philipstown to Tullamore—Read a Second Time 1414

State of the Queen's County—Motion for a Select Committee to Inquire into it 1416

III. Lists of Divisions.

April 9. The Noes on the Amendment to the Arrears of Tithes Bill (Ireland)—That no Costs be Payable under the Bill, but those before Provided for 96

The Noes on the Question that the Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Bill be Recommitted 104

13. Contents on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill—in the House of Peers .. 454

Not Contents on the same Motion 455

May 7. Contents on the Motion of Lord Lyndhurst to Postpone the Disfranchising Clause of the Reform Bill 723

Not Contents on the same Motion 725

10. Ayes on Lord Ebrington's Motion for an Address to the Crown, relative to the Appointment of no Ministers except such as would carry the Reform Bill 866

1832. Page

May 22. Contents on the Question that the Tower Hamlets stand part of the Reform Bill 1256

Not Contents on the same Motion 1257

23. Not Contents and Contents on Lord Ellenborough's Amendment to the Reform Bill, to give Six Members to Lancashire 1395

Part of the Ayes and the Noes on the Question that the Liverpool Disfranchisement Bill be Read a Second Time .. 1414

IV. PROTEST.

Apr. 13. Against the Second Reading of the Reform of Parliament (England)—Bill 459

HANSARD'S

Parliamentary Debates

During the SECOND SESSION *of the* TENTH PARLIAMENT *of*
the United Kingdom of GREAT BRITAIN *and* IRELAND,
appointed to meet at Westminster,
6th December, 1831,
in the Second Year of the Reign of His Majesty
WILLIAM THE FOURTH.

Fourth Volume of the Session.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, April 9, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bills. Received the Royal Assent; the Consolidated Fund; Mutiny; and Marine Mutiny; Indemnity; Malt Drawback; Ordnance Department; Colonial Audit; and Cholera Prevention Act Amendment (Scotland.)

Petitions presented. By Lord DURHAM, from the Members of the Greenwich Political Union. By Lord KING, from Clerkenwell. By the Duke of RICHMOND, from Dundalk. By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from Hull, in favour of the Reform Bill; and by a NOBLE LORD, from the Freeholders of Eye, against it:—By the Earl of HAREWOOD, from the Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures at Glasgow, and by the Earl of SHAFTESBURY, from Stirling, for Protection and Relief to the West-India Trade:—By the Bishop of NORWICH, from the Tithe-payers of Newport Pratt, and Tieranan, for the Abolition of Tithes in Ireland.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND — SECOND READING.] The Duke of *Buckingham* rose to present a Petition from the inhabitants of Beaconsfield praying that the Bill for Reform which was then on their Lordships' Table waiting for a second reading, might not pass into a law. The noble Duke said, he took that opportunity of giving notice, that should their Lordships, which he hoped, and trusted, and believed they would, negative the Motion for the second reading of the Bill then before them, it was his intention to bring in, immediately after the Easter recess, a Bill, to be called, "A Bill to amend the Representation of England and Wales," the object of that Bill would be to give Representatives to such of the large towns therein-to-be named, as, from their increased population, wealth, and importance in the country, required to be Represented in Parliament: and also for the purpose of consolidating the Representation of certain boroughs now sending Members to Parliament, so as to make room for the new Representatives without any addition to the present numbers of the House of Commons, and so to extend the franchise as might, without depriving any man of that right he now possessed, prevent the exercise of undue influence in any borough. He now gave this notice, and, to prove the sincerity of his intention, he would conclude by moving that the notice be entered on the journals.

Petition laid on the Table.

Earl *Grey* rose for the purpose of proposing the second reading of a Bill which had been sent up to their Lordships from the other House of Parliament, and which was intended to amend the Representation of the people in England and Wales. To a Bill, so interesting in its nature—relating to such important objects — brought up from that House which was most affected by the amelioration which it aimed at effecting—passed through that House with a great and decisive majority—supported out of that house by an equally great and decisive majority of the people at large—it was not necessary for him to say that their Lordships were bound to pay the most earnest and serious attention. The subject to which the Bill related was one of paramount importance, for it effected a change in the constitution of Parliament, by altering the mode in which the Representatives of the people were returned to it. The Bill, too, came before their Lordships, as he had already said, supported by a large majority of the House of Commons, and by an equally large and decisive majority of the people at large. He felt that, in proposing to their Lordships the consideration of this measure, he had taken upon himself the discharge of a duty to which he brought powers very inadequate; but he had, on the present occasion, a support and consolation within himself which, he trusted, would enable him to go through that duty, and that was the consciousness that he was promoting the welfare and advancing the real interests of his country. He thought that, in the present condition of public feeling it would not be required of him to prove that this Bill was called for by the voice of the public, because, at all their open meetings, the people had supported it. He thought that it could not be necessary for him to show that the principle of this Bill was a principle which was entitled to the adoption of their Lordships, because, even by those who were the most adverse to the details of the present measure of Reform, the necessity of some Reform was at last admitted. That very night two petitions had been presented to their Lordships, one purporting to be a petition against this measure, and the other thanking their Lordships for having rejected the last Bill, but both stating the opinion of the petitioners to be, that some Reform was necessary; and, in compliance with that opinion, a noble Duke had that evening given notice to their Lordships of his intention to propose a bill to their consideration, which was founded on the three great principles of the present Bill which had been so often stigmatized as the principles, not of Reform, but of revolution—he meant the three great principles of disfranchisement and enfranchisement, and extension of the elective franchise to those who hitherto had not enjoyed it.

The Duke of *Buckingham* rose, as he said, to order. To save the time of their Lordships, and the breath of the noble Earl, he would at once inform the noble Earl that he had mistaken the meaning of the very few words which had fallen from him. He had particularly guarded himself against entering upon the question of disfranchisement. His object was to give the elective franchise to those who had it not, and he should not propose to take that franchise away from any one who now possessed it.

Earl *Grey* said, it would be premature in him to enter into the discussion of a question which was not then before the House, and he would, therefore, abstain from any further observations on that subject. But, after the curious explanation which the noble Duke had given of his embryo Bill, he must say, that he (Earl Grey) did not think that his description of it was at all misapplied. If he recollected rightly the statement of the noble Duke, the noble Duke meant to give the right of returning Members to Parliament to large, and populous, and wealthy towns. That was the principle of enfranchisement. He also understood the noble Duke to say, that, to make room for that addition to the House of Commons, without altering the number of its Members, he intended to consolidate and unite the boroughs which now separately and individually possessed the right of returning Representatives, into electoral districts, returning a less number of Representatives. Now, if the noble Duke took from a number of boroughs, of which each possessed the right of returning two Representatives, any portion of that right, as he would do by consolidating a number of them to return two Representatives only, and those too, by a sort of subscription, that, he would maintain, was acting on the principle of disfranchisement. As to his third principle—the principle of the extension of the franchise—he believed that the noble Duke did not dispute it; for the noble Duke had stated in express terms, that he intended to extend the right of voting. The noble Duke, therefore, meant to present their Lordships with a bill founded—he said it again, and without adverting further to the unsatisfactory explanation which the noble Duke had given of the terms in which he had introduced his notice—on the three great principles of disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and extension of the suffrage—principles which, their Lordships had often been told, were the principles not of Reform but of revolution. From that explanation of the noble Duke's intentions, he felt, he was happy to say, relieved from the necessity of saying anything to recommend to their Lordships the adoption of the leading principles of the present Bill. He had told them what those principles were; and having done so, he might call upon their

Lordships to give their sanction to the second reading of a measure founded upon a basis which was acknowledged to be just, even by those who opposed the measure itself, inasmuch as they would have an opportunity in the Committee of proposing such alterations in its details as might appear necessary and expedient. He was relieved, he was happy to say, from the necessity of taking up more of their Lordships' time on this subject by the admissions which had been just made by those who were accounted the most strenuous adversaries of the Bill. Its principles were generally—indeed, he might now say, almost universally—admitted. He did not know whether the noble and gallant Duke was still to be considered an exception to the universality of that admission. He did not know whether the noble and gallant Duke (the Duke of Wellington) had come round to the same points which all other persons admitted. The impression on his mind certainly was, that the noble and gallant Duke had, on the last occasion on which he addressed the House on this subject, avowed that he even was convinced some degree of Reform was necessary. He did not know, he repeated, whether such was or was not the conviction of the noble Duke; but if the noble Duke was inveterately bent on resisting all Reform—if the noble Duke was determined to remain an exception to the prevailing feeling of the day—he was perfectly sure that the noble Duke would find few to support him in his efforts to place a ban and interdict on the wishes of the people of England, who called, with almost unanimous voice for the immediate removal of every obstacle which interfered with the full enjoyment of their political rights. Not merely the necessity, but also the expediency, of Reform was conceded by those, who asserted that the necessity for Reform arose, not only from the acknowledged abuses of the existing system of Representation, but also from the declared sense and expressed energy of the public on the subject; because, if he understood aright the case of those noble Lords, who now, at the eleventh hour, admitted that some Reform was necessary, their opinion was founded on the continuance of public feeling in its favour, though they qualified their opposition to the present Bill by saying, that it was not this plan they required. It was clear, however, that the conversion of these noble Lords was owing to the voice of the people having been so long, so loudly, and so perseveringly expressed in favour of Reform, as to make them feel that they could no longer with safety withhold the consent of Parliament from this or some other measure of Reform. He was, therefore, relieved from the necessity—even if that necessity had not been in a great degree removed by the repeated discussions which had taken place on this subject, in which every thing had been said which could be said on the general principles of the Bill, and on the views and motives of those who had introduced it—he was relieved, he said, from the necessity of going into further arguments on this part of the subject, which, indeed, had been so fully canvassed, that it was impossible for him to add any thing to what he had already said himself upon it, and to what had been said so much more ably and powerfully by others. He should, therefore, proceed, assuming that the principles of the Bill were in a great degree assented to, and merely referring to what had been previously stated regarding its provisions, and the motives of those who had introduced it, he should proceed to examine, and to state, as briefly as possible, the general features and details of the measure itself. The Bill, then, to the second reading of which he now desired the assent of their Lordships, was a Bill founded on the same principles with the last to which, in its main features and provisions, it was almost similar. [" *Hear.*"] He certainly understood what that exclamation meant. He thought that he should be able to convince their Lordships that there was nothing in the circumstance of this Bill being founded on the same principle with the last, which ought to induce such of them as had voted against the last Bill, and were, nevertheless, prepared to assent at present to the principle of Reform, to withhold their assent from the present Bill. He had heard nothing as yet but a very general description of the Bill of Reform which the noble Duke opposite promised to introduce; but, judging from the expressions of the noble Duke, he should say that it was founded on the same principles with those of the present Bill—that was, on the disfranchisement of decayed and inconsiderable boroughs; on the enfranchisement of large, and populous, and opulent towns, and on the extension of the right of voting to those classes which had not hitherto enjoyed it. These being the principles, not only of the noble Duke's bill, but also of the different bills which had been introduced by his Majesty's Government, he would now proceed to notice the alterations which the present bill made in the provisions by which those principles were to be carried into effect—alterations which one of their Lordships had described as neither small nor unimportant, and which, he trusted, were of such a character as would recommend it to their approbation and adoption. "But," said the noble and gallant Duke opposite, "this Bill is not Reform, but revolution; its principles are enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and extension of the suffrage; therefore, it is not Reform, but revolution." By what process of reasoning the noble Duke arrived at that conclusion, or what logical distinctions the noble Duke drew between Reform and Revolution, he did not know; but this he did know, that there was nothing in the adoption of the principles which he had just recounted, which could entitle any man to give the bill in which they were incorporated a revolutionary character. A Reform in Parliament supposed a great change in the constitution of Parliament—it supposed a great change in the mode in which the people and their interests were to be represented; but all change was not revolution, and least of all such a change as was proposed in the present Bill. It was to be effected, according to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by an act of Parliament, passed by the united will of the Legislature, consisting of the King, Lords, and Commons. It might therefore, be fairly considered as effected after a sufficient and mature deliberation. It proceeded according to the known forms of the law, and was to be carried into execution by the three known authorities of the state—King, Lords, and Commons. It infringed on none of the ordinary authorities of the land—it violated none of the ordinary forms of the Constitution—it invaded none of the privileges of their Lordships — it interfered not with the prerogatives of the Crown: why, then, should it be stigmatized by the term "revolutionary?" Revolution was a word used to indicate a great change in the monarchy or State, carried into execution by a force superior to the law, and employed in keeping down the law? He maintained that neither in terms, nor in character, nor in principle, was this Bill revolutionary—it was truly and substantially a Bill of Reform. He must again ask the noble Duke how he distinguished Reform from Revolution? For his part, he must say, that he knew of no way of effecting a Reform in Parliament—a measure which pre-supposed the existence of some defects in the Constitution of Parliament—except by one of these three modes: either by disfranchising ancient, decayed, and inconsiderable boroughs—which was the ancient practice of the Constitution, and that was disfranchisement; or by giving the right of Representation to large and populous and opulent towns which had risen into importance, and were not represented, and that, too, was the practice of the olden times, and was enfranchisement; or by a great extension of the right of voting, which was also done in the good old times, and which he again said was not revolutionary. In some one of these three ways Reform must be effected; and, therefore, all the plans of Reform hitherto proposed by the great men who had preceded him, and also that plan of Reform which he had too presumptuously proposed to the House of Commons in 1793, had all proceeded upon one or all of these three principles united. He trusted, therefore, that he should stand, on the present occasion, before their Lordships acquitted of the charge of having strayed beyond the ancient limits of the Constitution, and of having proposed to the country a measure revolutionary in its character. He must revert once more to the great and general —he would not say acquiescence, but—affection of the people for this measure. He was not now speaking of the mob, nor of persons uninstructed and uninformed. Let not such noble Lords as were hostile to Reform, suppose that such was a proper description of the supporters of Reform. Reform was supported not merely by the multitude, but also by the great mass of the power, the opulence, the intelligence, the education, and all that was important in the community. Was it necessary, therefore, for him to argue that a measure so supported was not a revolutionary measure? He implored their Lordships to consider again and again who the parties were who most strenuously advocated this measure. Were they not those able, and active, and industrious men, who had acquired large property by their habits of enterprise and assiduity, and who had, therefore, the deepest interest in its security and preservation? Could it be supposed that in the nineteenth century men of such talents and such energy would come to the Bar of their Lordships' House, and would entreat them on bended knee to adopt, as a means of salvation for their persons and their property, a measure which in its principles was ruinous to both, and which in its effects must be destructive to those institutions which they wished not to pull down, but only to repair? The supposition was too monstrous to be entertained seriously even for a moment. He should, therefore, proceed onward with his task, repeating what he had already said several times to their Lordships, that this Bill, like the last, was founded on the three great principles of disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and extension of the right of suffrage. Having, on a former occasion, twice addressed their Lordships at great length, in explanation of the views which induced him to propose a measure based on those three great principles, he should abstain from entering on the present occasion into any general argument in support of their propriety, as it would fatigue their Lordships without giving them any additional information. He should, therefore, in a great measure, confine himself to a statement of the circumstances in which this Bill, with respect to its details and provisions, differed from the last. And first, with respect to the principle of disfranchisement. It was proposed by the present Bill, as it was by the last, to disfranchise a certain number of ancient boroughs, which had fallen into decay, and which were considered, and, in his opinion, justly, as an abuse in our system of parliamentary Representation, and to enfranchise in their stead, large, populous, and wealthy towns. The number of boroughs which it was proposed to subtract from the present Representation was fifty-six; and the manner in which they had been selected, he would explain. In the last Bill it was proposed that a certain line should be drawn by which all places, the population of which was under 2,000, and in which a sufficient constituency could not be found or created, so as to ensure the independence of the boroughs, were to be disfranchised. The advantage of that plan was, that it drew a line which was limited in its application, and which was still so general as to get rid of all suspicion of partiality. It was imputed, however, as an objection to the Bill, that in this respect it proceeded upon a principle that was not safe—namely, upon the principle of population alone. He had contended on a former occasion—and, if it were necessary, would contend again now—that that objection was not founded in reason; for the population was taken, not as a principle, but as a criterion by which the relative importance of places could be best ascertained. He did not know that any great inconvenience would have arisen from adhering to that criterion; but from an anxious desire on the part of Government to consider calmly, and to examine dispassionately, all objections made to the Bill, and to adopt any improvements upon it which might be suggested not incompatible with its principles—a desire which animated the Government not less now than it did when it was framing this measure—they had resorted to another criterion. They took, as a better criterion than that of population singly, a criterion derived from the number of houses, according to the census of 1831, and from the amount of the assessed taxes in the same year, combining the two together on principles of calculation, the best which could be adopted, as explained and approved by those who were considered the highest authorities in such matters. According to this criterion, a list had been formed in which the smaller boroughs were arranged agreeable to their comparative importance, the least important being those of which the constituency could not be made adequate to the return of a fit Representative to Parliament. Having done this, the Government adhered to the old number of boroughs to be entirely disfranchised. He was well aware, that by taking this mode of calculation, there was not that definite line of demarcation drawn which was drawn in the former plan. He thought, however, that when their Lordships went into Committee and minutely examined the list of boroughs, with their relative importance to each other, they would not, upon any of the principles on which it was attempted to amend the Representation of decayed boroughs, think of limiting the number of boroughs to be totally disfranchised to less, though they might extend it, perhaps, to more, than the number specified in the Bill. Government had not deemed it either necessary or expedient to extend the measure of disfranchisement so far as some persons wished to carry it. He trusted that in stopping where they had done, Ministers would obtain the approbation of their Lordships, and more particularly of such of them as were opposed to them in many of the details of this measure. It was not necessary to say a word more on this part of the subject. He had already called the attention of their Lordships to the admitted fact, that in any measure of Reform, there must be some disfranchisement. The question was, whether the disfranchisement proposed in this Bill was too much or too little. He was of opinion, that it was not too much; but that was a question for the Committee to decide, and, therefore, no doubt as to the mode of its decision ought to prove an obstacle to the success of the present Motion. The next point of difference between the present and former measure was to be found in schedule B. When this subject was last before their Lordships, various objections were urged against this schedule. Ministers had been anxious to reduce the amount of those objections; and in order to accomplish that purpose, had, after taking the same criterion that was employed in the formation of schedule A, determined, instead of taking forty-one boroughs for partial disfranchisement, to select only thirty, and to select those which stood upon the list for disfranchisement immediately above those boroughs whose names were inserted in schedule A. That arrangement took eleven boroughs inserted in the old schedule B out of the new schedule B, and restored to them their original right of returning two Members of Parliament. In this restored list of eleven were some county towns, to the disfranchisement of which great objections had been stated. He knew that he should be told that this arrangement of schedule B left the Bill exposed to the complaint of being full of anomalies. He knew that it might be said, that the lowest borough in schedule B, was not more worthy to return a Representative to Parliament than the highest in schedule A. He knew that it might be said, that of those boroughs which were restored from schedule B to their old station, some were inferior in wealth and importance to many of those towns to which the elective franchise was not at present extended. He admitted the existence of all these anomalies in the Bill; but they were inseparable from the principle on which the Government had acted of retaining as much as possible of what existed at present. The only effectual mode of obviating an objection of this character was by doing more than had hitherto been done. Indeed, the only way in which any measure of Reform could be rendered perfect in theory would be by an entire new distribution of the elective franchise, in which case it would be necessary to divide the country into electoral districts. Ministers never had any such theory as that in view: on the contrary, they wished to avoid any change which went to that extent, and if they had left the Bill subject to this charge of being full of anomalies, it was for the sake of preserving the institutions of the country, as they existed at present; and if its being full of anomalies was the defect of the Bill, it was a defect which could only be cured by adding still further and greater changes to those proposed by the Bill, which, according to the declarations of the opponents of Government, were already too great and extensive. He had now stated the extent of the alterations in that part of the Bill which carried into effect the principle of disfranchisement. He should proceed to explain next the enfranchising part of the Bill. If there was any part of the Bill against which he thought that no objection could be fairly raised, it was that part of it which declared it to be right and expedient to give the right of suffrage to those great manufacturing and commercial towns which had risen of late years into importance, and which contained a mass of wealth and population equal to that of most of the capitals of Europe. The towns thus brought into the representative system were to be found in schedules C and D; and here again was a considerable alteration introduced into the provisions of the present Bill, as compared to the former Bill. In the former Bill there were in schedule C twelve places which were to return two Members each, and in schedule D twenty-eight towns to return one Member each. The alteration made in the present Bill in those points consisted in their having transferred ten boroughs from schedule D to schedule C, thereby making the number in schedule C twenty-two, and adding two to the eighteen which were left in schedule D. The number of Members, therefore, to be returned by the places as they now stood in those schedules would be forty-four for schedule C, and twenty for schedule B, being a total addition of twelve Members for the towns which stood in those schedules, over the number contained in the former Bill. This had been objected to on the ground that it would increase in a dangerous manner the democratic tendency of the Bill. He could assure the noble Lords opposite, that he was ready to listen to and to discuss there, as he had elsewhere, and as he would on a former occasion have done more fully if they had allowed him the opportunity, all the objections which they might think it necessary to urge against this, or any other provision of the Bill. He was willing both on that occasion, and in the Committee, to give the best answer he was able to all such objections. It had been stated, then, that these schedules were highly objectionable, inasmuch as they would increase the influence of the democracy. Now, admitting—and he would admit it only for the sake of argument, since the fact was not so—all these towns would have an interest separate and distinct from, if not opposed to, the landed and agricultural interests (and that was the fallacy upon which the objection had been raised) he denied that there was any ground for the objection. And here let him observe, that their Lordships too frequently admitted what he must be permitted to call a most unfortunate and a most unfounded distinction between the interests of the trading and commercial, as separate from, if not opposed to the landed and agricultural interests. Convinced as he was of the necessity of the union of the two, by that harmony and good-will which was absolutely essential to the prosperity of both, and from the absence of which both must equally suffer, he could not help calling that distinction to which he had alluded a most unfortunate one. Reverting, however, to the objections which had been made to the schedules, he must observe, in the first place, that the access of influence to these towns was counterbalanced by the alteration which had been made in schedule B; and further, that the more the situation and character of these towns were examined, the more apparent it would be, that so far from their being opposed to the landed and agricultural interests they were, in fact, intimately connected with it. It was absurd for any man who took the trouble of looking at the names of these towns, to entertain the notion that trading and commercial interests were their exclusive interests. That these interests might predominate in some of the towns, he would admit was probable, but at the same time was it not certain that these places were intimately connected with large landed proprietors, who not unfrequently were the chief owners of the property in the towns, and whose influence could not possibly fail to make itself felt in the return of Members to Parliament for such places, although the Members so returned would naturally be looked up to as the guardians of the interests of the electors? Let them look at such towns under the present system. Were not those who were nearest and dearest to their Lordships actually sitting at this moment, as they had formerly sat, for such places as those to which their Lordships objected to extend the elective franchise? and would their Lordships, with this experience of the past and present, now tell him that for the future nothing but democratic influence could possibly prevail in the elections of Members of Parliament for large and populous towns? Was there any reason in these anticipations, or was not all the reason on the side of those who, judging from the experience of the past, and the natural course and consequence of things in time to come, calculated that, while a constituency would of course be made to elect an efficient Representative, yet that the choice of who that efficient Representative should be among a number of competitors, would be decided for the future, as it had been before, by the influence of connexions, which seldom failed, and which when properly exercised, he trusted never would fail. That, however, which had blinded noble Lords to this plain and obvious view of the case was the presumption, the erroneous presumption, that all elections would be like the last, when the people were in a state of great and universal excitement. They were not to judge of what elections would be by what they had been, during the ferment which this question of Reform had produced. Let this question be once satisfactorily set at rest—let the cause of the ferment and excitement be removed—and he was convinced that things would run in their former tracks, that the legitimate influence of rank, and property, and good conduct, would be restored. He said the legitimate influence of rank, property, and good conduct, for without good conduct rank and property never ought, and he hoped never would, have any influence at all, but good conduct combined with rank and property had in all times past and must in all times to come, exercise a degree of influence which was not only perfectly legitimate, but which it would be at once impossible and mischievous to remove. He trusted their Lordships would see that the number of Members given to places in these schedules was not too great when they considered the growing prosperity of the great interests concerned—of those important interests which he did not, as had been falsely stated, clash with any other interests, but which formed an integral part of those general interests upon which the welfare of the nation depended. He would not detain their Lordships longer upon this point. He thought that he had said sufficient with respect to it to induce their Lordships to go into the consideration of it in Committee, there to discuss it impartially, and ultimately to settle it in such a manner as should best conduce to the general satisfaction of the people, and, therefore, to the promotion of the best interests of the State. He now came to the consideration of the third of those great principles which, in the view of noble Lords opposite, constituted revolution, but which in his mind were essential to an efficient Reform, and had nothing of a revolutionary tendency in them. This principle was the extension of the elective franchise. On this point again he felt himself relieved from entering into any long argument, as well from the full discussion it had already undergone, as from the admissions of its former opponents. A few observations, however, it would be necessary for him to trouble them with. He should in the first place observe, that he had been hitherto confining himself to the alterations which had been made in the Bill, and had not touched upon those parts of the measure which had undergone no change. Thus the county Representation had not been altered. He might presently find it necessary to trouble their Lordships with a few words upon that part of the measure, but, in order to save the time of their Lordships, and to spare himself, he wished to abstain as much as possible from entering into principles which had been before discussed, and into those provisions of the measure which remained unaltered. After this explanation, then, he would pass on to the third principle—the extension of the elective franchise to 10*l.* householders. A noble Earl (Bathurst) opposite, presented the other night a petition from the University of Oxford, which petition, by the way, admitted, by implication at least, the necessity of Parliamentary Reform—no small proof, if any were needed, of the existence of that necessity, when it was considered from whence that petition proceeded—a noble Earl, he said, had the other night presented a petition from the University of Oxford, and in so doing represented the petitioners as complaining of this measure of Reform on the ground that it was of too sweeping a character—that it conferred the new right of voting at the expense of existing rights—that the new rights so conferred were rights unknown to the Constitution — and that the franchise created by the Bill was objectionable, because it was of general uniformity. Now, that there was any validity in either of these objections, he begged most unequivocally to deny. The gravest part of these objections was that which talked of the rights conferred by the Bill being unknown to the Constitution; and yet he was almost ashamed to trouble their Lordships with one word in reply to it, after the masterly and eloquent refutation of it which their Lordships had heard from his noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, during the discussion of the last measure. As, however, the charge had been repeated, it would, perhaps, be expected of him that he should not allow it to appear again unaccompanied by its refutation; and although he should demonstrate, more feebly than his noble and learned friend had, yet it was necessary that he should demonstrate, that, so far from being unknown to the Constitution, the rights conferred by the Bill were in strict accordance with the principles of Parliamentary Representation under that Constitution. Let him, then, remind their Lordships that, on the occasion to which he had alluded, his noble and learned friend had quoted to them a Report of Mr. Serjeant Glanville, in which the principle of Representation was stated to be this, viz.—that, if a new writ were to be issued to any great town or other place, for the return of Members to serve in Parliament, and if there were no definition in the Writ, as to who should or who should not be the electors, the right of voting would be *ipso facto* in the resident householders. In this Report of a Committee of the House of Commons drawn up by Mr. Serjeant Glanville, it was well known that Selden, Finch, Noy (afterwards Attorney General), and other men eminent for their legal knowledge, who were on that Committee concurred. The words of that Report, which he thought he might as well quote, were these:—'There being no certain custom 'nor prescription who should be electors, 'and who not, we must have recourse to 'common right, which, to this purpose, was 'held to be, that more than the freeholders 'only ought to have voices in the election; 'namely, all men inhabitant householders 'resident within the borough.' That position his noble and learned friend had challenged any lawyer to contradict, and no lawyer had accepted the challenge. The doctrine was further confirmed by a passage out of Whitelocke's book on Government wherein he said, 'Whenever any 'question about elections was brought 'before the House, the inclination of the 'House of Commons always was, to favour 'popular elections; observing, that the 'more free they were, the more they were 'for the interests of the community. At 'this day, in many boroughs the election still 'remains popular, being exercised by all 'the inhabitants except alms-men and 'such like.' He contended, then, that the right of voting in inhabitant householders was the ancient right of voting under the Constitution of this country. By the present Bill, this right was only re-established. The Bill conferred the right of voting upon resident householders of the boroughs; but it limited that right to resident householders of 10*l.* a-year. Thus, then, the Bill, so far from introducing a new right, did in fact merely restore with a limitation, an old acknowledged right. It was, in truth, nothing but the present scot-and-lot right of voting limited to householders of 10*l* a-year, and with the further limitation of requiring that the rates and taxes of such householders must be paid before they could be qualified to vote. He would now call the attention of their Lordships to the alterations which had been made in this part of the Bill. In the former Bill it was proposed to ascertain the right of parties to the exercise of the elective franchise, conferred by the Bill in four ways: by their being rated to the poor-rate at 10*l.*, by their being assessed to the inhabitant house duty at 10*l.*, by their paying 10*l.* rent, and by the value of their tenement being 10*l.* These provisions were altered in the present Bill, and the right to the exercise of the franchise was made to depend on the value of the tenement only, provided that the rates and taxes payable in respect of the tenement had been paid. The reason of this alteration having been adopted was, to simplify the provision, and more effectually to guard against deceitful and fraudulent practices. When they came to discuss this part of the measure in Committee, as he trusted they would, with the view of rendering it as perfect as possible, he thought he should be able to show to their Lordships that there would not be that difficulty which some anticipated, in ascertaining the value of tenements. Indeed, on this point he had a practical ground of confidence that his view of the facility of ascertaining the value was well-grounded. Their Lordships must, of course, be aware, that it was upon the value of property that the present right of voting in counties depended. A county voter was qualified by a 40*s.* freehold. The value of the property of these freeholders must be ascertained as well as the value of the tenement of a 10*l.* householder; and as he had never heard that any great difficulty had been experienced in the first case, he could not imagine why any difficulty was to be anticipated in the second. But, as it happened, they had the test of actual experiment by which to try this part of the measure. By a certain local act — an act regulating the election of the guardians of the poor of the city of Norwich—it was provided that the right of voting at the election of guardians of the poor should be in the inhabitant householders of 10*l.* a-year. Now, it had not been found that the least difficulty had arisen in elections under this local act, and he could not, therefore, see why there should be any difficulty in this provision of the Reform Bill. But, as he had before observed, he should be prepared in Committee to discuss fully this objection to the provision, as well as any other objections which had been or might be brought against it. Among those objections there was but one which he felt it necessary to notice on the present occasion. It had been said that this part of the measure would lead to bribery. Now if there had been one thing more than another which he and his colleagues had been anxious to guard against, it was bribery; and he should be happy to adopt any suggestion which would give additional security against so destructive and disgraceful a practice. But these were matters which it would be much more convenient to discuss in the Committee—where, he repeated, he should be ready to examine any suggestion which noble Lords might offer, and to concur in any alteration of this provision of the Bill which noble Lords might think calculated to improve it, provided only that the changes suggested did not diminish the extent of the qualification. Again, it had been urged, that by this qualification they would create too large a constituency. He was satisfied that this was a mistake. In about six or seven places only, would there be established a constituency liable to objection on this score. The fallacy on which this objection proceeded was this, namely, that all the qualified tenements entered would give voters. This was far from being the case. Considerable reductions must be made for the number of persons absent, the number of tenements occupied by women, and the number of householders who would be disqualified from other causes—these, it was calculated, would reduce the number entered by at least one-fourth. Then again it seemed to be forgotten, that the qualification was not exclusively a 10*l.* house qualification, but that it included all houses above 10*l.* A great proportion would be of a much higher description—indeed, of so high a description, that no one of their Lordships would think of excluding the owners of them from the enjoyment of the elective franchise. The houses rented only at 10*l.* would be much more trifling in number than any of their Lordships who had not carefully examined the returns would suppose. He would, with the permission of their Lordships, read to them the result of a calculation which he had made from the documents before Parliament, with the view of showing what exaggerated notions some persons entertained of the numbers of the constituency which would be created by this provision of the Bill. He had obtained returns, from which it appeared, that there would be 115 boroughs possessing from 300 to 500 voters, sixty-eight boroughs possessing from 500 to 1,000 voters, 20 boroughs possessing from 1,000 to 5,000 voters, and only 12 boroughs possessing from 5,000 voters upwards; so that, from this document which he held in his hand, it would appear, that out of no less than 215 boroughs, there were only thirty which would have a number of voters exceeding 5,000. He, therefore, thought that after this, it could hardly be again contended, with any show of success, that this 10*l.* clause threatened all that danger and mischief with which it had so much been attempted to alarm the public mind. "And now" continued the noble Earl, let me ask your Lordships who are the persons that will be enfranchised under this clause; they are persons who in my opinion, from the very circumstance of their occupying a 10*l.* house (the rent and rates, and taxes, of which, be it observed, must, under the provisions of this Bill, be paid) have given a sort of guarantee of their holding a certain station in life—who thereby exhibit an open sign of their possessing some property—who have given a pledge to the community for their good conduct—and who for the most part are married men and the fathers of families. And will any one, after this, venture to say that we cannot intrust such men as these with the constitutional privilege of choosing their own Representative in Parliament? I trust that from what I have already stated, your Lordships will perceive that every care has been taken to guard against those consequences which some persons assert must necessarily follow on this Bill passing into a law. But there is yet one other security which I have not mentioned. It must be remembered, that according to the provisions of this Bill, a considerable time must elapse before any individual can be admitted to a right of voting; for he must have been in occupation of a 10*l.* house for a-year up to the last day of the July preceding the election; besides which, another three months will elapse between the formation of the list by the Overseers and the ultimate conclusion of the register; so that if the election take place in the interim before the register is finished, a man will not be entitled to vote till he proves that he has occupied a 10*l.* house up to the last day of July in the year preceding; in which case he will have been a 10*l.* householder for two years instead of one; while, if the election takes place after the finishing of the register the voter will have been an occupant for at least a-year and a quarter. I know that one objection taken to this part of the Bill will be, that it does not insist on a man having occupied one house only for that length of time, but that a variety of residences will suffice to confer the qualification, so long as he can show that he has for the required time been rated at 10*l.* I do not, however, believe that any difficulty is to be apprehended from this division of occupancy, more especially as this same thing already exists in a manner in the scot-and-lot boroughs, where the duration of occupancy is only limited to six months. I have gone through the three great principles of the Bill now before your Lordships, and I think I may say, that it is now conceded that those three principles must necessarily be a part of any extensive measure of Reform. It was distinctly stated by a noble friend of mine, who voted against the Reform Bill when it was last before this House, that the extension of the elective franchise must be one of the principles of any measure of Reform, and that any measure which was likely to give general satisfaction must be founded on an extension of the elective franchise. These, then, my Lords, are the circumstances under which I once again venture to propose this Bill to your Lordships for the purpose of asking you to pass it into a law; and I would on this occasion repeat what my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack well remarked, when the former Bill was under the consideration of this House:—in his words I would say, "It is a large measure of Reform that is required;" and for myself, I would add—that, if we wish to tranquillize the country, if we wish to give satisfaction to the people, and if we wish to place this question in such a position as to prevent its being again agitated, we must indeed admit by our acts that it is a large measure of Reform that is required. But the Oxford petition, presented by the noble Earl, also objects to the uniformity in the voting which is to be introduced by this measure: on what ground, however, except that uniformity will produce a representation of the general interests, I am not very well able to understand. In my apprehension this uniformity will be a very great advantage; for, wherever there is uniformity there is great facility for the exercise of the elective franchise. But if by this objection any one means to say, that the effect will be to confine the power to any particular description of interests, I beg leave most decidedly to dissent from that proposition, as it is one put forward without any degree of colour whatever in its support. It is true, that the right of voting is to be uniform; and so far, I say, the arrangement is beneficial. But, though the right of voting will be uniform, the possession will be various; and the habits, the feelings, and the dispositions of the persons possessing the franchise will vary according to the different circumstances in which they are placed. The 10*l.* voter of Liverpool and Manchester, for instance, will be a very different sort of person from the 10*l.* voter of Guildford and Dorchester; and your Lordships may rely upon it that the result of this apparent uniform franchise will be, that in one place we shall have a class of voters supporting the commercial interests—in another a class supporting the manufacturing—and in a third a class supporting the agricultural—that in one place we shall have only a wealthy constituency; and that in another, the lowest class of the people will share the franchise. Again, in such places as Chatham and Plymouth, we shall probably have a class of voters willing to give their support to the Government; this latter may be objectionable; but, at all events, it is right to state it, for the purpose of showing that though the franchise is uniform, the possession is various, and, therefore, calculated to admit all the interests of the community to their just preponderance, and to produce that very effect which all ought to wish for who desire to see the country really, and not nominally, represented. I feel that I have trespassed too long on the time of your Lordships in describing those principles which I doubt not were already well known to the House. It is by these great principles, however, (which by some are said to constitute revolution, but which I say embody the true and real doctrine of Representation), that I now call on your Lordships to examine a measure which I most confidently believe is not only calculated to benefit the country, but to afford a safe and easy transition from the difficult situation in which we are now placed to one of happiness and prosperity. There are one or two other alterations in this Bill, to which I must likewise call the attention of your Lordships, in order that you may be fully aware of the difference between the two Bills. The first of these is the addition of a number of Members, so as to leave the whole amount of the House of Commons the same as it is at present, owing to which the proportion of the number of Members for England and Wales is only reduced by the thirteen additional Representatives that are to be divided between Ireland and Scotland. Another alteration is that of continuing the right of voting to the freemen in perpetuity, which by the former Bill was only given to those in actual existence, or who had already inchoate rights. A third alteration is that by which, instead of leaving the boundaries of the boroughs to be defined by Commissioners, those boundaries are to be established, and the limits of every borough defined by a bill, which is now before the House of Commons. This is an alteration which falls in, I believe, with many of your Lordships' views; to it I anticipate no objection whatever. There are a few other subordinate alterations, which it is not now necessary that I should state, as I have no doubt that your Lordships will admit that I have stated sufficient to show what is the general tendency of the principal alterations which have been made. I wish, however, to say a few words as to the question of how far the agricultural interest will be injured by the change that will be produced by this measure. For my own part, I do not believe that that interest will suffer in any degree. How will the case stand? There will be 144 county Members; the old boroughs, including those now in schedule B, will return 264 Members; and the new boroughs will return sixty-four Members; making in all 472 Members; to which we have to add three county Members given to Wales, and one to a Welch borough—making (with the former twenty-four Members for that principality) twenty-nine Representatives for Wales, and altogether 500 Members for England and Wales, a proportion which will be ample I think to secure to this part of the United Empire that preponderance it so well deserves. With respect, then, to the relative proportions of the different parts of the kingdom, I do not believe that England and Wales will lose any of their just influence by giving up thirteen Members to Ireland and Scotland; for surely 500 Members out of 658 are sufficient to maintain them in that station which their importance rightfully claims. But how stands the argument with respect to the agricultural interest? I am prepared to contend that the 144 county Members will belong to that interest, and that out of the 264 old borough Members there will be just as large a proportion as ever in favour of the landed proprietors: there only then remains the sixty-four new Members; and it seems to me, that even should the whole of these fall to the lot of the commercial and manufacturing interests of the country, it will be a share to which those interests are justly entitled, when we take into consideration their present and their increasing importance as well as the extraordinary advances they have made, and are making in wealth, population, and intelligence. I have now, my Lords, concluded all that I have to say with regard to the principles of this measure. In describing those principles I can assure the House that I have felt the vast importance of the task I have to perform, and the difficulties of the position in which I am placed. I have endeavoured, as far as I could (and if I have not executed that intention I regret it most sincerely, and ask pardon of your Lordships for the failure)—but I have endeavoured, as far as I could, to avoid any thing that could revive former unpleasant recollections, or give rise to any acrimonious or party feelings, which, I am sure, ought to have no admission here, or at least ought not to influence your Lordships in deciding one of the most important questions ever submitted to your judgement. It has been my most anxious wish to introduce this measure in such a tone and manner, that in entering upon the discussion of it we might divest our minds of all former prejudices, and of every thing like a feeling of personal animosity, and consider it with that calmness which so great and important a question deserves at our hands, losing all consideration of partial interest in the general desire to agree upon such a measure as the wants and wishes of the country render necessary, and will best redound to the interests of the nation at large. This, my Lords, was the temper—this the mode in which I was desirous of performing my task. I am sensible that I must have done it inefficiently; and, indeed, of this I am the more sensible, when I advert to the extreme importance of the interests involved in this question. There are interests mixed up with it not only affecting the commercial, the manufacturing, and the agricultural classes, but involving our foreign relations, the security of property, and the general prosperity of the country. All these interests, I need not tell your Lordships, have been materially affected by the long and continued suspense, and by the indescribable anxiety which has pervaded the public mind on this absorbing subject. My Lords, I am ready to maintain that his Majesty's Ministers are not to blame for this suspense or this anxiety, or the state of things which has led to the necessity of agitating this great question. I am far, however, from imputing the delay in settling this question as a matter of blame to those who have thought it their duty to oppose the measure now under discussion: it has, perhaps, been the unavoidable result of a conflict of opinion where the subject under consideration has been of the greatest constitutional importance. All that I desire is, that we should now proceed with this discussion in such a manner as may lead to a happy and to a speedy termination—speedy, indeed, I may well say, for happy it cannot be without that other ingredient being added. The opportunity of doing this is now afforded to your Lordships, and and I hope that it will not be lost: I hope it, my Lords, the more as that opportunity once let slip, will not be easily recovered. My Lords, I have been accused of using on a former occasion the language of intimidation. I disclaim the intention of using any such language. Nothing can be further from my wish than to influence your Lordships by any improper or unworthy fears in deciding a question which should rest alone on your most deliberate judgment. But surely it is not the language of intimidation if I wished to address to your Lordships that which any honest counsellor might address to the most despotic sovereign on the face of the earth—my humble advice on the subject; and I am sure that all I ventured to state to you was, that no influence, no authority, no power was sufficient safely to set at defiance that unanimous demand which was founded on public opinion. My Lords, I never counselled you to yield to any hasty or temporary outcry. I never advised you to give way to the exorbitant and unruly demands of clamour; but what I did then say, and what I now repeat, is, that the deliberate sentiment of a great and intelligent people, expressed after a long period allowed for reflection, is entitled to your Lordships' attention—and the House will give me leave to say also, to your Lordships' respect. I can assure the House, that I feel the deep and vital consequence of this measure to the country, to your Lordships, and to myself: to your Lordships, because I have no doubt it is your wish, as it must be your interest—and, indeed, I may add, that it is most necessary for the good government of this country, that the people should look up to you with respect and reverence. My Lords, I admit that we have of late heard none of that outcry on the part of the people, which first marked the progress of this Bill. In its place, a fearful silence at present prevails—a silence which may, perhaps, lead some persons foolishly to imagine that the people are no longer looking at this question with the same feelings of interest. But I caution your Lordships to beware how you form that opinion. You may rely upon it, that though the people are silent, they are looking at the deliberations of this night with no less intenseness of feeling than that which has marked them from the very first day of the agitation of this question. I know that it is pretended by some that the nation has no confidence in this House, because there is an opinion out of doors that the interests of the Aristocracy are separate from those of the people. On the part of this House, however, I disclaim all such separateness of interests; and, therefore, I am willing to believe that the silence of which I have spoken is the fruit of a latent hope still existing in the bosom of the people, that your Lordships will no longer oppose their often and loudly expressed wishes. With respect to myself, I am very sensible that no one ever stood before Parliament with the same personal responsibility as that with which I am invested. I have been made the subject of attack—I have been laid open to what I believe to be great injustice—and I am sure that I have been the subject of much undeserved suspicion. And why? Because I have proposed that which I thought my duty to my Sovereign and to my country required me to propose—a measure, which is now in its principle generally admitted to be necessary, and about which the only difference is as to the extent of some of its details. All that I can say upon this subject is, that I exercised the best of my judgment. I believed (again to use the words of my noble and learned friend) that a large measure of Reform—an efficient measure of Reform—such as should meet the just expectations of the people, was necessary, if we wished to enable this country to resume that peaceful and prosperous situation to which it is impossible for it to return, so long as this agitation and anxiety pervade the public mind. My Lords, I knew well the difficulties that I should have to encounter; but I was led by my sense of duty to disregard them. I hope that I may be allowed to say, that in all the progressive stages of this measure I have never deviated from that steadiness of purpose which I believed would finally lead to success; and that, as on the one hand, I have not been deterred by threatened difficulties from proposing this Bill, so, on the other, I have not suffered myself to be forced by clamour into the prosecution of it by means to which I could not in my better judgment consent. Under these circumstances, and feeling that this may possibly be the last time that I shall have to press this measure on your Lordships' attention, I must confess that I look with something like hope to that which appears to be a sort of approach to a favourable decision on the part of this House. If, however, I should unfortunately sink in the struggle, I shall at least have the consolation of feeling that I did, to the best of my judgment, that which I thought right and fitting, regulating my actions according to the sincere dictates of my conscience, with the one sole object of effecting that which should be best calculated to promote the interests of my country. What I pray for is, that if misfortune is to follow this measure, it may be confined to one, and that I may be the only victim. I pray that the consequences of my failure, may affect neither the security of my Sovereign, nor the prosperity of my country, and, above all, I pray that the union between your Lordships and the people, which is so necessary to the welfare of both, and on which your Lordships' influence, authority, and usefulness, essentially depend, may not be weakened, but strengthened, and confirmed. My

Lords, I have now only to move that this Bill be read a second time."

Lord *Ellenborough* said, he should not do justice to his own feelings, or to the feelings of the House, if, he did not acknowledge the perfect propriety of tone and manner, with which the noble Earl had introduced this important question to the consideration of their Lordships. As far as he was individually concerned, he would follow the good example which the noble Earl had set. He was, however, compelled to dissent from the Motion of the noble Earl for the second reading of this Bill. The noble Earl had told them that he acted under the dictates of his conscience, with a firm conviction of the rectitude and wisdom of his course, and, at the same time, under a responsibility greater than had ever rested upon any other Minister. In giving the fullest credit to the assertions of the noble Earl, he must lay claim for himself, and for those who acted with him, to the belief that they also acted under a sense of deep responsibility and a perfect conviction of the propriety of their opposition. He hoped their Lordships and the country would do the same justice to their motives as they were ready and willing to extend to the noble Earl. He was always disposed to look with respect and favour upon any measure brought to the Bar of the House of Lords by the House of Commons, but more especially when that measure happened to be one which concerned exclusively the interests and privileges of the House of Commons, and the interests and privileges of their constituents, and which was, besides, supported by a large body of that House. He knew also, that there was a considerable body in the country by whom the majority of the other House upon this measure was backed. But, when he recollected how often the House of Commons had changed their minds upon this Bill—not fewer than eleven times upon that most important part of it, the uniformity of the franchise; that they enfranchised and then disfranchised, and then enfranchised again, the same place—that they had made forty-seven changes in one schedule, and thirty-three in another, and that, only fifteen places remained untouched out of the number that had been originally affected by the measure; he must say, with every possible respect for the House of Commons, that they did not seem exactly to know their own minds upon a subject, be it recollected, as important as ever affected the interests of this country, involving nothing less than a total change in its Constitution. He must, therefore, take leave to look with some minuteness and distrust into decisions proceeding from minds apparently so little fixed in their intention, and possessing such imperfect knowledge of their own interests. The noble Earl had placed the question, at the outset, upon its true ground, viz., whether this Bill should now be read a second time, or got rid of altogether. On this question, he was ready to join issue with the noble Earl. The noble Earl seemed to think that he was entitled to claim, from the notice given by a noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) in the early part of the evening, relative to a bill, in substitution of the present, which the noble Duke stated it was his intention to introduce after Easter, if this should be rejected, the assent of that noble Duke, and those who thought with him to the principle of this Bill. The noble Duke, however, had distinctly told him that he should oppose the second reading of the Bill before the House. Surely the noble Earl, after having heard that notice, and that assertion was not at liberty to anticipate their Lordships' sanction for a Bill in all respects so objectionable as the present. The Bill of the noble Duke had this peculiar advantage, that it would afford their Lordships an opportunity of considering the whole merits of the question. For his own part he did not believe that the measure now introduced to the House by his Majesty's Government, was such a one as could be passed, but, he trusted that, it would be so entertained by their Lordships as to give them an opportunity of considering in what manner a conciliatory adjustment of the question might be effected. Since the first introduction of the measure of Reform, it could not be denied that the position of the question had been materially altered, but he entreated their Lordships to consider, before they determined not to adhere to the opposition with which they met the former Bill six months ago, when it appeared in a somewhat different form, but, certainly, the same then as now in principle, what effect would be produced upon the country by now giving their sanction to the principles which they then rejected. It was said, that the measure now came before their Lordships recommended by the majority of the House of Commons, and by the great body of the people. Before they acted upon such a ground, it was desirable that they should see of what that majority, and the support by which it had been created, was composed. In the first place, it included the whole of the Whig body as it had long existed in the two Houses of Parliament, and all its adherents, either from connexion, interest, or opinion. That body appeared now to be tolerably unanimous, though it was known that, five years ago they were so far from being agreed upon the question of Reform, that, with the exception of the noble Earl now at their head, and a very few of his immediate personal adherents, the whole of that body went over to Mr. Canning, a Minister, who to the last opposed Reform with all his energies. Now, he thought there was one suggestion that must occur to every man's mind upon this point, and it was, that this party having been out of office so long, and without much regret manifested by the people, it might be just possible that they were aiming, through thus administering to the popular passions, to draw the people into a reconciliation, and so obtain power to themselves for many successive years. In addition to these, the next body in importance giving an active support to the measure were the Roman Catholics of Ireland. But he thought it not difficult to understand the motives and the expectations in which that support was given to the measure, in the language used to the Minister of the Crown, when he was told by these Catholics, "It is your time now, ours is to come." This time, as was well understood, meant the dissolution of the Union, which the noble Earl (Grey) had said was the same thing as the separation of the two countries; and so it was. Again the present Bill had received the hearty support of all those persons who had entertained doctrines subversive of the Constitution from 1793, down to the present time. This party had emerged from the obscurity in which, it had been lost for many years, but, was now again active and clamorous for the passing of the Bill. One might imagine, from the very fact of these bodies having concurred in supporting it, that, that would have been sufficient to have made the noble Earl look with suspicion upon his own measure, and to have made him take it back to his most serious reconsideration. There were likewise at first—although there were not now a very large body, for their eyes had been opened to the delusion—there was a considerable portion of the poorest classes who clamoured for the Bill. They were led to believe, for a time, that it would give them cheap bread, and their minds were filled with expectation that it would bring about an entire change in the gradations of society—that their situation would be raised, and that of the rich made lower. They thought, in short, that it was to lead to a revolution in which, they were to find an advantage, and, although the noble Earl told them that there would be no revolution, there could be no doubt that these poor people were deluded into the belief that there would be one, and that that was the source of a great part of the clamour with which they cried out for the measure. Besides these, there was a large body in the country, for whose opinions he entertained the greatest respect, a body independent alike of Whigs and Tories, respectable in their station of life, and still more so in the manner in which they discharged its duties, who were undoubtedly anxious for some change in the form of the Representation. In his mind the opinions of this class of persons were entitled to respect—he had almost said to deference—from any other portion of the community. And he was sure there could be no one in their Lordships' House who would not, on such a subject, desire to meet the objections and wishes of that body, to consult and reason with them, and to do that which should satisfy them, and fix their attachment to all the institutions of the country. But, had there been no change in the opinions of this class since the last general election? ["*No.*"] What! had there been no change in the county of Dorset? Why, had they not now another election in the county of Dorset? Because it had become clear to Mr. Portman, the Member for that county, and his friends, that if another election were now to take place another anti-Reform Member would be sitting for the county of Dorset. If, then, these were the circumstances under which the question now presented itself to their Lordships, what was it that should prevent them from doing as they did in October last, and refuse to pass the Bill? Now those who were then against them had come to be with them, and, strengthened by their support, he confessed he was at a loss to know why they should not give effect to their own wishes, and the wishes of this intelligent and reflecting body of the people. The addresses of the supporters of the measure had been referred to by the noble Earl; but had none but the friends of this measure addressed the throne? Any one who moved at all in society in the country, amongst persons possessing property, must know that a great majority of those persons were against it. They too, had addressed the Crown. Whether his Majesty had been advised by his Ministers to read and consider those addresses or not, he did not know; but, it was certain, that those opposed to the Bill, had in very large numbers, and in vast bodies of wealth and character laid their opinions at the foot of the Throne. It had become common with the supporters of the measure to attribute the agitation and present distresses of the country to the delay in passing it into a law, and to give out that if the question were settled in that manner, such agitation would cease, and prosperity be restored. His opinion was very different. This was a measure settling no question connected with the prosperity of the country, but opening many, and containing as many contradictions and anomalies in itself, as those which it proposed to take away from a great and ancient and complicated system. They were told, that the present measure was an improvement upon the last, that the principle of disfranchisement was changed, and that, instead of being founded simply upon numbers, property would be combined with numbers in the qualification. But, had they made any progress in rendering the Bill just? He contended that they had not, but that, on the contrary, there were points in which the injustice of the last measure had been greatly aggravated in this. In the last Bill, the number of places to be disfranchised was left open to them, to be decided upon according to the result of their deliberations. In this their Lordships were called upon without investigation, to decide at once that fifty-six boroughs should be deprived of all their Members, and thirty others of half their number. Upon what principle of justice this was done he was utterly at a loss to comprehend. This brought him to the general question of the disfranchisement of the nomination boroughs; and, with the permission of their Lordships, he would say a few words relative to the individuals by whom those boroughs were represented in the House of Commons. It had been very much the fashion to represent the Members who sat for the nomination boroughs as monsters, preying upon the vitals of the country, and the abettors of corruption of every description. Now, he would state to the House the different classes from which the individuals representing those boroughs were taken, and in doing this he would not refer to any boroughs which were not contained in the schedules, although if he pursued a different course, it would give additional strength to his argument. Amongst the Representatives of the boroughs contained in schedules A and B, there were forty sons of Peers of whom only fifteen were returned by the influence of their fathers and brothers. He well recollected, that on a former occasion, the eloquent reasoning with which a noble Earl, whom he then had the happiness, which he feared he should not possess now, of following as a leader, enforced his opinion relative to the advantage which resulted from the sons of Peers obtaining an easy access to the House of Commons, where by associating with men of ability and practical experience, they acquired a knowledge of many points of policy, and of the general management of the affairs of the country. By the present Bill, forty persons standing in this situation would be excluded from the House of Commons, and amongst them, Lords Lowther, Mahon, Stormont, and Porchester, and Mr. Stuart Wortley. The last-named individual served some time with him in office, and he knew hardly any disadvantage which could befall the country greater than that of excluding such a man as he was from a situation in which he might employ his great talents in the public service. No person who knew anything of the materials of which the House of Commons was composed, but must be aware that the distinguished individuals whom he had mentioned were of the number of those who, from their ability, industry, and knowledge, were the most fit to be employed in the public service. Twenty Members sat in the House of Commons for these boroughs, who were connected with the army, and not only possessed the feelings of soldiers, but were perfectly well acquainted with the organization of our military force. Amongst these were many not undistinguished officers, including Sir Edward Kerrison, Sir William Pringle, and Sir Henry Hardinge, who, particularly the last, had greatly distinguished themselves in the civil as well as the military service. If the Bill should pass, all these able persons would be excluded from the House of Commons. Seven Members of the naval profession also sat for the proscribed boroughs, all of whom were men of great reputation, and among them was found that able officer, Sir John Beresford. There were likewise fourteen great merchants similarly situated, including Mr. Attwood, Mr. Sadler, Mr. Irving, and one of the members of the house of Baring, Then there were seventeen Members returned for these boroughs, who belonged to the profession of the law, including the Solicitor General for Ireland, the Solicitor General for England, the late Attorney and Solicitor General for England, Sir Charles Wetherell, Mr. Pemberton, and Mr. Macaulay, and many other persons who were equally distinguished in the profession of the law. In fact, all the most distinguished men in the legal profession were Members for the boroughs which it was proposed to disfranchise. All persons who had considered the question, must be perfectly aware of the inconvenience which would be felt, if there were no individuals in the House connected with the colonies, by whom the interests of those important possessions could be represented in Parliament. At present the East-India interest was represented by eight Gentlemen, amongst whom were Sir George Staunton, Sir John Malcolm, Mr. Loch, Mr. Marjoribanks, the two Mr. Alexanders, and two members of the house of Forbes. These Gentlemen represented the country trade of India; the trade between India and this country; one of them was intimately acquainted with the feelings and interests of the civil and military servants of the Company; another was acquainted with China; two were distinguished members of the Court of Directors; and all these were to be excluded by the new representative system. There were, besides, twenty-seven Gentlemen of large landed property, who, under other circumstances, would possess fair pretensions to represent counties, and whose independence was above all suspicion. In addition to these, there were thirty-nine other Gentlemen who possessed property in the funds, or were in other respects fully qualified to sit in Parliament. Amongst them was the noble Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who, by a curious coincidence, when he was ejected from the University of Cambridge, took refuge in the very same borough which received Sir Robert Peel, when he was ejected from the University of Oxford. Now, he would ask the House, whether it was possible to destroy the system by which such individuals as those whom he had referred to obtained an entrance into Parliament, without altering the practice of the Constitution? Was it possible to substitute for the existing system, any other by which the various interests of the empire could be so adequately represented? It was futile to refer back to a distant period of the history of the Constitution, when the country was in a different situation from that in which it at present stood. Undoubtedly, at a time when we had no colonies, no public debt, and very little trade and commerce, a very different state of the Representation from that which now existed, might have suited the wants of the country; but it should be recollected that Parliament had now to frame laws for the government of very distant countries, far exceeding our own in population, and equalling it in wealth. There were, besides, a great variety of commercial and trading interests, which, under no other system of Representation than that now prevailing, could be represented in Parliament. The advantage of the present system was, that it left no class unrepresented; and yet the country was told that all the distresses which it suffered were referable to the corruption of the persons who sat for the boroughs. The very names of the Gentlemen were sufficient to negative such a charge. It was impossible that the persons whom he had mentioned, should not feel as deep an interest in the welfare of the country, as any other individuals. Was it not a fact, that practically the great mass of the business of the House of Commons was executed by these Gentlemen? At the last general election, when the old Representatives were rejected, the people did not select a single individual (he said this without intending offence to any one) who had shown that he was possessed of even ordinary ability. He would ask their Lordships, whether the conduct of Parliament during the last few years afforded any justification of the continued and increasing dislike of the present system? He would bring to the recollection of the House, what had been done by that calumniated Parliament, as it was once called, by the noble Viscount, the Secretary for the Colonial Department. Between 1822 and 1830, which was before the present Ministers entered office, the Parliament repealed 15,500,000*l.* of taxes, and, by a provident and able management of the Public Debt, the interest upon it was reduced 4,000,000*l.* The same Parliament also reduced the public expenditure more than 4,500,000*l.*; it reduced all the salaries of offices connected with patronage, to the extent of 700,000*l.*; abolished more than 4,000 offices, and, in the last year of the Duke of Wellington's Administration, it repealed a million of taxes. During this period exports increased in official value 12,500,000*l.*, and imports 15,000,000*l.*, and our coasting trade 9,000,000 of tons. This, he was aware, was a money view of the question, and unfortunately that was the only view which was generally taken of it; but Parliament had, at the same time, directed its attention to other important questions connected with the general interests of the empire. The criminal laws were revised and amended, and improvements were made in the mode of conducting civil suits. Alterations were also made in our criminal procedure; Parliament, likewise, came to a decision upon other questions with respect to which there existed a great difference of opinion, but the decisions of Parliament were made in accordance with the general feeling of the most enlightened persons, and certainly in conformity with the opinion of the present Ministers. The currency was established on what appeared to him to be a safe and wise basis. The Corn-laws were fixed upon the best principle which had ever been applied to that question, and they had worked better than any others heretofore adopted. In the course of the same period, the Test Act was repealed, and the Bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics was passed. Everything possible and just was done for the establishment of civil and religious liberty, and for the general welfare of the realm. With these proofs of the activity and wisdom of Parliament, it was not fair to say, that Parliament had been unmindful of its duties. He would go further and assert, that under no system of Representation partaking of a much more popular character than that which at present existed, could such measures as those he had just adverted to have been adopted. The Members elected under the proposed system would be too much under popular influence; and, however right they might be in principle, they would carry their principles too far, and would never adopt the system of compromise which was productive of so much benefit when applied to questions which had long divided public opinion. But was it possible that the Government of the present day could influence the decisions of the House of Commons to any great extent, through the Members who held places in the gift of the Crown? How did the fact stand with respect to this? In the reign of George 1st, there were 276 Members of the House of Commons who held places of that description, and this, he believed, was under a Whig Government. At the commencement of the reign of George 2nd, their number was reduced to 256; at the beginning of the reign of George 3rd, to 200; and at the present moment it was not fifty. This, of itself, was an enormous reduction of the influence of Government, and viewed, in connection with the increasing power of public opinion and of the Press, he had a right to say that it was a practical Reform. When the noble Earl proposed to alter the Constitution of Parliament, he ought to state what offence it had committed under its present Constitution. Did he propose to cashier it for what it had done, or for what it had neglected to do? What did the noble Earl propose to effect by a newly-constituted Parliament? Was it the noble Earl's intention to carry the measures to which he had referred, further, or to repeal them? The House ought to hear from the noble Earl what were the measures which he thought to carry in a reformed Parliament, but not in this, in order that they might have an opportunity of examining and sifting them, with the view of ascertaining whether they would be advantageous to the country. It was possible that the noble Earl might suppose that with a reformed Parliament he might be more successful in his attempt to impose a duty on the import of cotton, which would prevent the produce of our possessions in India from finding their way into this country; or that he would then be able to establish a tax on the transfer of stock, in direct violation of an Act of Parliament; or that he could then carry into effect his measures for ruining the wine trade of the Cape, and the timber trade of Canada. If these were the objects which the noble Earl had in view, let him avow them. Under the existing system of Representation, the Members who sat in the House of Commons were persons who knew something of the subjects which came under their consideration, and if they were excluded, as they would be under the new system, the Government might be able to carry its measures into effect. There was one point of the greatest importance, which was well worthy of the consideration of the House in discussing this question. It was this—whether the country was not in such a state that its prosperity or distress arose out of extraneous causes over which the Government and Parliament had no control. When he contemplated the enormous capital and overflowing population of this country, dependent for subsistence on foreign supply and foreign demand, when he beheld the conflicts of capital, occasioning the pulling down of manufactories in one place, and the setting of them up in another—he could not but think that it was on extraneous causes rather than on any measures which might be adopted by Government that the prosperity of the empire depended. He would say, further, though with deep regret, that every day this state of things was becoming worse; but, if this were so, could any thing be more insane than to teach the people that national prosperity depended, not on the measures but on the form of Government? The consequence would be, that Parliament would every day be called upon to reconsider the new Constitution, and to reform it again and again. He would now direct their Lordships' attention to what he conceived to be the most important part of the Bill, namely, the uniformity of the franchise. He did not object to it because it was popular; on the contrary, he was desirous that a more popular franchise should be adopted, but not to be applied every where. As it existed at present, even the poorest persons contributed to send Members to Parliament to express their wishes. It would be idle at the present moment to go into the details of the measure to inquire whether it was possible to establish a rule for fixing the value by which the right to the franchise was to be ascertained; but, he could not avoid observing, that no men were less capable of executing that task satisfactorily than Barristers. He also, objected to the Barristers being appointed by the Judges, and to their sending in their bills to the Treasury. By these means a connexion was maintained by the Government, which might lead to improper conduct on the part of the Barristers, for they had it in their power to enfranchise or disfranchise numbers of voters, contrary to the intention of the Act. The odium arising out of their improper conduct would be thrown, not upon the Government which benefitted by it, but on the Judges. With respect, however, to the 10*l.* franchise, he was of opinion that it would not give power to the middle classes. It went below them, but not to the poorest classes. He had looked to the practical working of the measure more attentively than the noble Earl appeared to have done, and he found that it disfranchised both the middle and the poorer classes. He found that in all England and Wales, there were only thirty-one places in which the renters of between 10*l.* and 20*l.* would not have a decided majority over all the other voters, and the result was, that they would have a majority of fifty on the whole representation of England and Wales. It was evident that the Bill would disfranchise the middle classes. He respected those classes, but he thought some misunderstanding existed as to who they were. He understood the middle classes to be composed of persons who possessed the means of education, but not of idleness. It was the class from which almost all distinguished men were drawn—from which many of their Lordships had sprung. The Bill did not give power to them, but to the class immediately above the poorest—those who were the plaintiffs in courts of conscience. They would have the power of legislating for their poor debtors. What effect would this have on the public prosperity? In the first place the power of legislating for persons who had property would be given to those who had little or none. A noble Lord had stated on a former evening that the Church of England was in a minority compared with Dissenters. He did not believe that such was the case, but he knew that the great body of those who were sincerely attached to the Church, and determined to support it, was to be found in the highest and poorest classes. Dissent predominated in the peculiar class to which a preponderance of power was given by this Bill. Let their Lordships consider what would be the effect of the measure with respect to Scotland and Ireland. A great many of the Members now returned for Scotland were Presbyterians; but they were men of large property, and desirous of maintaining the establishments of the country. But, under the Bill the Members for that country would be Presbyterians of a lower class, among whom was to be found whatever yet remained of bigotry and a persecuting spirit. With respect to Ireland, the immediate effect of the passing of the Bill would be, to render half the Representation of that country Roman Catholic. Under such circumstances, how would it be possible to uphold the Church Establishment in Ireland? The Government and Parliament were bound to protect the property of the Church. He recollected hearing a right reverend Prelate declare, the doctrines of that Church would remain even though its property was taken away; but he confessed he was desirous of preserving its property also, and he was afraid that its property, if not its doctrines, would suffer by this Bill. He would next proceed to consider what would be the effect of popular Representation on the acts of the Government. The only thing which could render office desirable to any man who was worthy of having it was, that it gave him the power to carry into effect measures which would benefit his country. Did the noble Earl entertain any hope that, in a Parliament such as the Bill would give him, he could carry any measure which was opposed to the public feeling of the moment? If they changed the Constitution of the country, it would be necessary to change the persons who were to carry on the Government. All measures to be proposed must in fact be submitted to the consideration of influential individuals out doors, and framed so as to flatter their opinions; and they would then be brought forward not on the responsibility of the Government, but on the recommendation of Committees. Thus would be removed the great practical advantage which the country now enjoyed of having Ministers selected for their ability, who weighed all measures maturely before they brought them forward, and waited for the most favourable opportunity to propose them. It was necessary to look, not only to the revolution which the new system would occasion in the conduct of men in office, but also to the effect which it would produce upon the opposition. During the last thirty years a body of independent men, not necessarily connected with the great mass of the people, had combined together for the purpose of advocating certain measures, and had exercised a powerful influence on the deliberations of Parliament by these means they acquired an aptitude for public business which enabled them to execute the duties of office, whenever his Majesty's wish or public opinion rendered a change of Ministry necessary. Under the new system, however, there would be no opportunity for forming a regular opposition, because the representative body would be constantly undergoing changes. There would, indeed, be an opposition in the country, backed by mobs, which would dictate to the Government. It was proved by the history not only of this country but of others, that whatever might be the form of the Government—whether the most absurd and monstrous democracy or the most absolute monarchy or despotism—that was practically the best which afforded able men an opportunity of coming forward in the public service. The present Constitution of England did that beyond any which had ever been known. By the present system this admirable end was attained—that while one Government existed, another was always in a course of preparation to qualify itself for the task; and from this it arose that in this country there was no man, however low his condition but that by abilities and conduct he might raise himself to comparative comfort, and thence upwards to the highest offices of the State; and principally the State was enabled to avail itself of the talents of such men through these very boroughs now so much reviled. This, they were told, was indeed no longer an advantage worth considering, for that every tenth man you met was a man of talent. All he could say was, that he was not so fortunate as to meet with them in his walks. But granting that, in the ordinary sense of the words, men of talent were more frequently to be found now than formerly, still not one in a hundred of them would be found available for the public service. If the change proposed in this Bill was agreed to of necessity further alterations must be made whenever it was demanded. There could be no successful resistance to whatever demand was made. Let this Bill be passed, and there would be such a House of Commons as would render it impossible for any Government to be conducted on any regular principle of action. No series of measures could be carried by any Government with such a House of Commons as this Bill must lead to. Changes of policy would continually be forced upon the Ministry. How could a House of Commons elected under this Bill deal with questions of commercial policy? The modified principles of free trade, to which noble Lords who advocated the Bill were attached, had made no converts among the peculiar class which it was now proposed to endow with preponderating power. That class still believed the exclusion of all foreign competition to be the true rule. Go back to that policy; teach foreigners that we had tried the new liberal system, and had failed; teach them to adopt the principles in their intercourse with us which this class thought best, and the consequence would be, ruin to our trade, and famine for the people. The noble Lords opposite were teaching the people a dangerous lesson. They told the people that the form of Government was the great cause of distress. Would the Bill now proposed remedy that distress? It was not even pretended that it would, and if the people had the Bill and still found distress, they would of course, pursuing the instructions they had received, again demand fresh changes, and fresh changes could not be denied them. This Bill was to remove anomalies, and to correct contradictions, but it contained greater contradictions and greater absurdities than were to be found in the system it was to supersede. Their Lordships would excuse him if he mentioned a few of those absurdities. In the first place, every man who rented a house of from 10*l.* to 50*l.*, unless he resided in a borough was to be excluded altogether from the franchise, notwithstanding, he belonged to a class of persons of the most intelligent and respectable character. No householders of that class, however, were to have a vote for a county, but all such renters were to have a vote for the borough they resided in. Upon what principle, in consonance with the construction of the Bill, was that distinction made? Then there were seven towns left without Representatives which were larger in population and in extent, and were more wealthy than enfranchised Walsall and Whitby. Again there were five boroughs in schedule B which had twice as many voters and twice as large a population, but were only to have half as many Members as five other boroughs which were to be left untouched. But there was something more extraordinary and more monstrous still. There were Newcastle and Gateshead, which latter place had been discovered in a wonderful manner to be a place of importance, for who but the framers of this Bill would have found in it the qualifications which would entitle it under the circumstances, to return Members to Parliament? Newcastle and Gateshead, with their 57,000 inhabitants, were to have three Members, while Liverpool and Toxteth Park, with their 187,000 inhabitants, were by the Bill to have but two Members. Such an arrangement was monstrous. Then, with respect to the counties, Middlesex, with its 1,358,000 inhabitants, was to be confined to two Members; while Northamptonshire, with its 179,000 inhabitants, was to be divided, and was to have four Members. Again each division of Lancashire had a population of 670,000 inhabitants, while each division of Cumberland would have a population of only 84,000 inhabitants. Was it not monstrous to suppose that such absurdities, if passed could be suffered to continue? If such constructions as these were found in any ancient system of government, they could only be endured on account of their antiquity, but their introduction into a system which professed to cure anomalies, was out of all character. But there was another consideration, which made it impossible to suppose the measure, if passed, would be lasting. Could any one imagine that the new constituency, thus suddenly and unexpectedly gifted with the power of electing the House of Commons, would be content to exercise the franchise at so distant a period as once in seven years?—Oh no, they would require an election oftener; and, unless he was very much mistaken, they would have a right to claim — proceeding upon precedent, the vote of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) in favour of Triennial Parliaments. But what if that further concession was refused? Would this new constituency rest content? Assuredly not. If they could not exactly and at once rule the Parliament within doors, they could exact pledges from their delegates, and they would do so, as they had already done; so that the Parliament itself would be controlled by primary meetings of the people, and be no longer entitled to the character of a deliberative assembly. This their Lordships surely never could assent to. It was too monstrous, too wild, too impolitic, too unreasonable to disfranchise for the benefit of one class the rest of the community. But if it were done, how were the claims of the very poorest afterwards to be resisted? A uniform franchise was to be adopted, and if that uniform franchise was to be maintained, and the rights of the poor were to be conceded and respected as they must be, the franchise now proposed must be lowered. Nor was there any resting place to stop at until it reached Universal Suffrage. The uniform franchise proposed must lead, not only to Universal Suffrage, but to a division of the country into particular parcels, measured by extent, and regulated upon theory. Indeed that principle had once been advocated by a noble Baron (Lord Durham) who usually sat on the other side of the House, but had not of late been often present in his place. Such being his opinion of the measure, and he knew not how any reasonable man who examined the question could come to other conclusions; he must adhere to the view he had before taken, and vote against the second reading of the Bill. He did not act thus without having considered the question as thoroughly as he was able. He knew that there might be inconveniences attending the rejection of the Bill, but he did not believe that any consequences would arise which could not readily be overcome if the Government met them with firmness and decision. But even though the inconveniences, the dangers arising from the rejection of the Bill, should prove much greater than he apprehended they would, still he felt himself in duty bound to resist it to the utmost of his power, rather than, by giving his assent to it, render himself, in any degree, a party to a measure which must lead to the overthrow of all the ancient institutions of the country, to the misery of those it was professedly intended to benefit, and to general desolation. The present Bill was even more democratic, and more objectionable and unjust, than the last. In the former Bill some security was given, by it being made necessary that the rent should be paid before the franchise could be exercised, but in the present Bill that did not exist. Again in the present Bill a 10*l.* householder might live in fifty different residences in the course of a year, and still enjoy the exercise of the franchise; in the former Bill that was not the case. But if the enfranchising clause of the present Bill was more objectionable than that of the last, the same might be said of the disfranchising clause. The only principles he could discover in it were those of injustice and unreasonableness. It was arbitrary, and without the show of necessity. The numbers of fifty-six and thirty were taken and declared to be positive and unalterable, without the slightest argument or statement to support the assumption. Their Lordships, in fact, were not to be allowed to investigate the subject. The Minister proposed to cut off, to annihilate, fifty-six boroughs, and to partially disfranchise thirty more; and the concurrence of their Lordships was demanded, not upon inquiry, not upon proof, but simply because the Minister had proposed it. They were not told they might consider the measure, and when they deemed advisable, alter it; they were not told they might exercise deliberation and judgment; but, on the contrary, the noble Lords opposite were unbending; they would permit of no alteration, would allow of no amendment. And if that were the case, what was the good of going into Committee? If their Lordships were determined to resist many of the provisions of the Bill, and the noble Lords the Members of the Government, were determined to allow of no alteration, but were pledged, as they avowed, to do every thing in their power to pass the Bill in its present shape, whatever might be the inconveniences and the dangers of rejecting the measure now, the inconveniences and the dangers of rejecting it in a future stage would be infinitely greater. If danger was to be apprehended from the rejection of the Bill at the present time, now when their Lordships had given it no countenance, no support, what was to be expected if their Lordships, by agreeing to the second reading, should lead the people to believe that the Bill would pass, and should afterwards reject it? If, after their Lordships had associated themselves with the Bill and had signified according to the rule and precedent, their concurrence in its principles, they should ultimately reject it, merely because they could not make it what they wished, would not the evil be tenfold greater than if they were not to mention its principle? There could be no comparison in his opinion, between the probable dangers. The question was, not as put by the noble Earl (Grey). Their Lordships were not called upon, by their vote upon the Motion to decide upon the general question of Reform. They were there as Peers of Parliament, and to act in accordance with the dictates of their consciences. The measure was the measure of the Government, and for it the Government were responsible. To the Bill, therefore, he, in the discharge of his duty, should say, "Not content." Whatever might be the consequences, he would say, in the language of the noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby), whose example six months ago he had followed. "I will not be an accomplice in the crime, although I may be obliged to participate in the results." He moved as an Amendment that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, he felt extreme unwillingness to address their Lordships at that period of the debate, being perfectly aware of his incapacity to offer any new arguments on the question, particularly as the several topics to which the noble Baron who preceded him had chiefly addressed himself had been already discussed so thoroughly in that House when a Bill of the same nature as that now before their Lordships was formerly under consideration. It was the less necessary, indeed, for him to trespass long upon the House after the clear and powerful exposition of the question in all its bearings by his noble friend at the head of his Majesty's Government. The powers of his noble friend had never been more conspicuously displayed than they had been that evening. The noble Baron opposite (Lord Ellenborough) had said, that the question now before the House did not affect the general question of Reform. To that statement he (Lord Melbourne) did not assent. The Motion before their Lordships was, "That this Bill for the Reform of the Representation of the people of England and Wales be read a second time." The question, therefore, to be determined by their votes was, whether or not they would agree to entertain the general subject of Reform in the Representation, or would resolve to set that subject aside altogether. The speech of the noble Baron was directed no less against the principle of Reform altogether, than against the details of the Bill itself. All the facts which the noble Baron had stated respecting the nomination boroughs were, no doubt true; and he himself had been for years in the habit of concurring in statements of the same effect as those now made by the noble Baron; but all the arguments which the noble Lord had endeavoured to raise upon those facts went to show the expediency of preserving the whole of the nomination boroughs. All those arguments were, in fact, directly opposed to the general principle of Reform itself. They who would be prepared to stand up for "things as they are," would do well to rest their opposition to every degree of amelioration upon the arguments of the noble Lord (Lord Ellenborough). But with any man who looked to the signs of the times, and who admitted that changes were necessary in the state of the Representation, those arguments would be of little weight. It was unnecessary to go over those arguments, as they were already completely met by this one unanswerable argument—that it is impossible to maintain the constitution of the House of Commons in its present state. He should not trouble the House with a repetition of the observations which he had made on the subject when the question was before under the consideration of their Lordships. On that occasion he had been found fault with by the noble Lord, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, for having gone into a discussion of the details of the Bill, when the question before the House related to its general principles; and he thought that he should now subject himself to the same reproof if he followed the noble Baron into the discussion of details which were properly subjects to be considered in the Committee. Although he was anxious for the passing of the Bill, yet he would be far from holding out to the people exaggerated expectations of any advantages which it would confer upon them. Still he thought that the strong feeling which prevailed amongst the people on the subject of Reform ought to have great weight with the House. In the present state of public feeling, and in the present posture of the affairs of the country, it seemed to him to be impossible to carry on the Government without some alteration in the Constitution of the House of Commons—laying the Representation of the people on a broader basis. That there were advantages connected with the present system of Representation he would not deny. But whilst the disadvantages were prominent and obvious—so plain to the eyes of all as to excite the indignation of the people—the advantages, on the contrary, were in their nature such that they could be produced and made evident only by close investigation and by abstract reasoning. He might be told that although the disadvantages were more easily perceived by the people than the advantages, still the latter more than compensated for the former, and that, therefore, in altering the present system of Representation, his Majesty's Ministers were sacrificing to popular clamour advantages which the people did not understand. But he denied that he for one was influenced in the course which he pursued on the present occasion by factious clamour or by democratic intimidation. At the same time, however, he looked upon a reasonable deference to the will of the people distinctly expressed to be one of the conditions of the government of a free people. "*Hæc est conditio populorum omnium liberorum.*" The irresistible influence of the opinion of the people was manifest when the government of the noble Duke opposite fell to the ground, without the pressure of much external opposition. It was perfectly clear to every man on that occasion, when the Administration fell into the hands of his noble friend, that some measure of the kind now proposed must be brought forward; and when his noble friend stated, amongst the principles on which his government was formed, this principle of reform, no noble Lord, except the noble Duke (Wellington), who might be expected to take that course after the strong declaration which he had made on the subject when in office, stood up in his place to avow himself opposed to the noble Earl's administration, on the ground that it was formed on the principles of Reform. But if any noble Lord were wholly opposed to that principle, it would not have been at all an unusual course for him to stand up on that occasion and express his opinion. In another place it had been objected that his noble friend was wrong in having introduced the measure at the time which he had chosen. It had been said, that he ought to have waited until the fever of the public mind should have subsided, and the people should be capable of giving the subject a calm and deliberate consideration. Every man who knew anything of human nature, must know, that if his noble friend had not brought forward the Reform Bill as early as possible after his appointment to office, he would have been suspected of insincerity in his professions, and of an intention to evade the redeeming of his pledges. He thought, therefore, that his Majesty's Ministers had to defend themselves only as to the extent of the measure which they had brought forward, and that neither as respected its general principles, nor the time in which they had introduced it, were they fairly open to reproach from the most determined opponent of the Bill. As to the extent of the Bill, he would say that it was often necessary to resist the wishes of the people, and to withhold what they called for; but when they called for ameliorations, the necessity of which was acknowledged, it was the wisest course to remove to the utmost practicable extent all real subjects of complaint. In framing a measure of Reform, it was impossible to have stopped short of the present Bill. If those who were friendly to what was called moderate Reform, could succeed in carrying a measure framed on their principles, it would not only increase the discontent, but would produce ultimately more danger to the institutions of this country than the Bill which they denounced as being too extensive and sweeping. It was impossible for him to add anything to the strong appeal which his noble friend had addressed to their Lordships; but he would most anxiously implore them not to suppose that the silence which prevailed at this moment was the silence of content, or that the quiet was attributable to anything but to the most determined spirit. He regretted deeply that the noble Duke who was lately at the head of his Majesty's Government, was so decidedly opposed to this measure. The noble Duke had earned for himself a reputation full of glory and of renown; he stood beyond all question at the head of modern warriors, and had achieved deeds which displayed a master mind; but he would remind the noble Duke that those who in early life were graced by the brightest fortune, were sometimes visited by reverses as signal as had been their successes. Nor was that difficult to account for. The same bold, inflexible spirit which, bending before no difficulties, and appalled by no dangers, had achieved extraordinary acts when suited to the circumstances of the time, failed when applied to a period different in its character. These qualities sometime prevented those who were endowed with them from the full and unprejudiced examination of great questions in the altered positions in which the progress of events might have placed them. The Reform Bill was a great change, undoubtedly; but he would beg leave to tell their Lordships, that if change was effected upon sound principles, its advantages would not be confined to the mere removal of the evils which it was intended to remove, but it would give rise to advantages which were not originally expected from it. In conclusion, he had only to say, that if the Bill went into Committee, and any amendments were proposed founded in wisdom and supported by sound reasoning, he should be willing to give his assent to them.

The Bishop of *Durham* said, he would readily forego the privilege of addressing their Lordships if he did not feel that the peculiar situation in which he stood, the nature of the subject, and the respect he owed to the Government, rendered it incumbent upon him to state the grounds upon which he should be compelled to give his vote on that occasion. He approached the subject with great diffidence and with many misgivings not merely from a consciousness of his inability to grapple with it on account of its vast extent and importance, for he well knew the consequences which must arise from a single false step, but from also being aware of the obloquy which would attach to one of his profession for venturing to pursue the course he felt it his duty to adopt. He might say, indeed, that he had had some experience upon the point already, and the obloquy he was likely to incur operated upon his mind as a reason why he should explain his opinion to their Lordships, lest he should be charged with timidity or doing that under any shade of concealment which he would hesitate to do publicly. He did not then intend to enter into any analysis of the measure, or to discuss any of the arguments which had been advanced in its support, he meant simply to state the grounds of his opposition to the present motion. He viewed the measure proposed with respect to the effect it would have on the religious and moral interests of the country, and doing so he could not vote for it. It might be right for him at once to say that he did not consider the rejection of this Bill implied the rejection of Reform *in toto.* The question had been so much discussed, and such hopes and expectations had been excited, that he believed there must be some measure of Reform. What that measure ought to be he would not pretend to say. It could not however be denied, that the country was divided in its opinion with respect to this Bill; that there were a great number of people who thought it would lead to the worst consequences, and he therefore thought in the first place that some attempt ought to have been made to consult the wishes and judgments of both parties. Nothing of that sort, however, had been done; and indeed he might go further and say, that the Bill, regarded as a final measure, pleased or satisfied no one. One party in the country viewed it with apprehension and alarm, while another regarded it only as a step to further changes. The Bill, therefore, in that respect, was any thing but satisfactory. Another requisite he should expect in any measure of Reform, and which he did not find in this, was, that some great practical grievance should be removed by its operation, or that some great practical benefit should be conferred. In this instance he did not hear it professed that any great practical grievance was to be remedied, and it had certainly not been shown that any great practical good was to be bestowed. Theoretically, undoubtedly much good was spoken of, but practically none. But if in those two respects the Bill failed, at all events their Lordships had a right to expect that the measure proposed would give security for carrying on the Government. It, however, did no such thing. It provided only for further change, and set a dangerous example of destruction and annihilation. It swept away privileges without necessity, without inquiry, without information, and in spite of reason. It made change apparently for the sake of change, and, without any necessity, it proposed a constitution far more democratic than the present. Such an alteration he thought an injury, and an injury of so grave a character that he could not support it. These were among the reasons which had compelled him to come to the determination to vote against the Bill. They had been admonished to watch "the signs of the times." He took the admonition kindly, but to him it was superfluous. He had watched the signs of the times; he had attended to what was called the march of intellect, and he found abroad a restless disposition—a love of innovation—a wish to destroy institutions because they were ancient,—a desire to set the subject over the ruler, and to trample the ruler under the subject. He saw these restless desires, and he saw also that this Bill would increase the circumstances which engendered them. If this measure should pass into a law, the necessary consequence would be the deterioration of the House of Commons. Step by step would that assembly decline till it came to the lowest point of descent. The effect of such a change would be most prejudicial to the moral and religious interests of the people. Atheism and infidelity, dissent and discord, had already effected much mischief, and it would be worse than bad policy to make a palpably mischievous alteration in the constitution, merely because the destruction of that constitution was clamoured for. If the Bill were passed, it would be impossible to maintain tranquillity without further innovation, leading to the complete annihilation of all those institutions on which our forefathers had prided themselves, and which had for ages secured the prosperity of the country. But it was said the condition of society had rendered the measure absolutely necessary. He knew that a considerable change had taken place in society. The so styled march of intellect had done much, but its good remained to be proved. "Knowledge was power" unquestionably; but much of the knowledge now disseminated was superficial and injurious, instead of beneficial, especially when not under the guidance of well-regulated principles. Unfortunately that species of knowledge, when possessed by a person of inferior station, too often gave him an evil influence over his associates, one which under the Bill would be dangerous to the State. By the Bill they might get rid of nomination boroughs and the influence of Peers, but he very much doubted whether it would not give rise to a system of nomination far more baleful and more dangerous. He had thought it his duty to state the grounds upon which he should give his vote; and he was the more desirous to do so because the motives which actuated the members of the church had been grossly misrepresented. It had been said that they thought only of their own interests, and that they cared not for the welfare of the lower classes. Those were gross and unjustifiable aspersions, and he rejected them with indignation. He was most sincerely anxious to benefit the lower classes; indeed so much so, that he solemnly declared, if he believed this Bill would have that effect, he would forego his opposition, and give it his support. They were told to consider well the dangers of rejecting this measure. He had considered them, and he found them temporary; while those which would result from passing it were permanent, and would lead to ruin. If the Government of the country felt it necessary and right to afford protection to those who in the discharge of their duty, felt themselves bound to oppose this measure, he should have no fear as to the consequences of such a step. On the one hand, then, he saw temporary risk, and, on the other, permanent injury. He was, therefore, in duty bound to oppose the Motion for the second reading. He could not resume his seat without expressing his conviction that the noble Earl at the head of the Government contemplated none of those evils from the measure which he (the Bishop of Durham) feared; and also that, if the noble Earl did do so, he would be the last man to persevere in his present course.

Lord *Stourton* trusted it would be received as some apology for his attempting to engage the time and arrest the attention of their Lordships on this great question, that he had not hitherto had an opportunity of expressing his sentiments. He did not presume to think that he could throw any new light upon this almost exhausted subject; but still, he was anxious to state the grounds in which, the vote he proposed to give in favour of the measure was based. He would begin by saying with Mr. Burke, "that it is the substance of the British Constitution, that the people should be taxed by their own Representatives." If this right of Englishmen was at former times valuable and necessary, how much more so had it now become, when the demands of the tax-gatherer were so frequent and heavy, and the national debt so enormous? When a sum of fifty millions was raised from people during the year, it was essential to their interests, and to the security of their property, that they should not only have full control over the expenditure, but, be satisfied also, that they really had this authority. This was in accordance with the theory of the Constitution from the earliest period of a Representative Government; and the great object of the Bill now before the House was, to restore to the people their full right in this respect. The earliest statutes that were now in existence, were perfectly explicit in declaring, that it was an inherent privilege of Englishmen that no man should be taxed who was not duly represented in Parliament. If such was the principle under which the Parliaments of the Plantagenets were constituted, how much more incumbent was it, that it should be acted upon in the nineteenth century, with our hundred-fold increased resources, and intelligence, and wants, and our present complicated fiscal arrangements? In the times of the Edwards, the taxes fell very lightly upon the lower strata of society, and yet they were duly represented. In our times, with our immense debt, and consequently, immense amount of taxes, the Constitutional principle applied with irresistible force. He had often been told that, it was one of the leading arguments of the late lamented Mr. Canning "that the construction and composition of the Commons House of Parliament was now the same as in the year 1688, when it accomplished such mighty things." He did not dispute that, but it was only because it was then in conformity to public sentiment, and to the knowledge of the age, that it rendered such essential service. But now, that the people had outgrown the basis on which Representation was founded, when everything was changed when trade and commerce and manufactures had passed into new and unrepresented channels, when the diffusion of knowledge had altered the relations of the middle and lower orders; when, from these causes, the artificial relations of the people to the Government and the Legislature had entirely changed; it was surely time that the Government should be adapted by a representation founded on a broader basis to meet such an altered state of things. The characteristic features and beauty of the English Constitution was said to be its adaptability to the changes which time was hourly effecting in every branch of society, and the characteristic principles, as he had stated, of the representative element of that Constitution was, that no man should be taxed who was not duly represented in the emphatically called House of Commons. These were now household truths to the people of England, who were hourly becoming more and more convinced of the fact, that the rights of property were identified with their liberty, and, consequently, that he who took from them any share of their property, without their own consent, expressed through the Constitutional channel of Representation, so far trenched upon their liberty. In consequence, however, of the changes which had taken place in late years they who contributed most to the taxes, had the least share of the representation. The power to tax the whole nation had thus become lodged in the hands of a few individuals, and small corporations were enabled to affect, more or less, the property of the bulk of the people. It was in this way that the Directors of the Bank of England had been enabled to carry on measures which interfered more with the property, the rights and liberties of the people, than could a thousand Acts of Parliament. They felt this, and, therefore, hailed with joyful acclaim the present Bill, which went to restore to them their constitutional right of being taxed only through their own freely-chosen Representatives. They felt, that, if they had hitherto been duly represented, they should not now be labouring under those heavy burthens which weighed down the industry and resources of the country; they felt, that the thousands of millions which had been squandered upon useless or mischievous objects, by profligate Governments, would have been saved to the country; and because they did feel these important truths, they would not be diverted from the attainment of the benefits to which the present Bill was the essential means, by any artful half measures like that menaced that evening by the noble Duke opposite.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* was not desirous, after the very able speech which had been addressed to their Lordships by the noble Baron, in opposition to the measure, to trouble the House with any lengthened address explanatory of the reasons which influenced him in giving his vote in favour of the Amendment, which that noble Baron had concluded by proposing. The noble Lord who had last addressed the House, had gone into the consideration of the theoretic principles of the Constitution of England for many years past, and had attempted to show that the changes which, during those years had occurred through all classes of the community, with regard to their artificial relations to the Government, had rendered a revision of those principles requisite, in order to adapt the institutions of the country to the knowledge and wants of the people. He (Lord Salisbury), however, could not see how the line of argument which that noble Lord had pursued, was in any degree applicable to the consideration of the present question. To him the question which their Lordships had to consider appeared to be, whether, under the proposed plan, the country was likely to continue in that state of prosperity and happiness in which it had for many years flourished. The noble Lord (Stourton) had stated many causes of the discontent which he imagined, how truly was quite another question, had induced the people of England to look for an alteration in the constituent principles of their representation. That would undoubtedly, have been a very good line of argument to adopt, had it been followed up by the Noble Lord's pointing out in what manner the measure of Reform then under consideration would afford a remedy—not a temporary adjustment, but a final and permanent remedy—for those causes of discontent. The noble Lord had, however, contented himself by stating the existence of a want of content in the minds of the people, cautiously abstaining from that part of the question which alone could assist their Lordships in their present discussion, namely, how far tranquillity was likely to be insured by enacting the present measure of Reform. He thought, that that House had also some reason to complain of the unsatisfactory manner in which the noble Earl who introduced the measure to their notice, had conducted his address. It would have been better had that noble Earl, when he proposed a measure of such vital importance to the interests and institutions of the country, detailed, or attempted to detail, how that measure, should it be agreed to by their Lordships, would act upon those interests and upon those institutions. Instead of that, he had confined himself to a mere detail of what events and what alterations had occurred in the public mind, and in the state of the country, since the period when the question of Reform was last before the House; and having done so, he proceeded in a measure to throw out threats of consequences likely to result, should their Lordships deem it prudent to reject the measure which for the second time they had submitted to them. On this point, however, he was convinced their Lordships had nothing whatever to apprehend. On the former occasion, that Reform formed the subject of a debate in their Lordships' House, he confessed that a strong excitement did prevail in the country in its favour, but since then, he was of opinion that that excitement had almost subsided. He believed, however, that a very strong feeling did exist for some degree of Reform, and anti-Reformer as he was, and anti-Reformer as he trusted he ever should remain, he confessed that he would be most willing to grant Reform, and thereby meet the wishes of the people, if he thought he could do so consistently with security to the institutions of his country. He had now, he conceived, stated sufficient to explain to their Lordships the nature of the vote which he was about to give; but there was one point, and one only, on which he desired to request some explanation. He wished to know how it was intended by his Majesty's Government to provide for the admission of official men into the other House of Parliament. During the discussion which took place on the first measure of Reform, their Lordships were told by the noble Viscount the Secretary of State (Lord Melbourne), that a clause was intended to be added in Committee, should the Bill be read a second time, to provide for that emergency. He (the Marquis of Salisbury), however, thought that such a provision ought to be in the original Bill, and that their Lordships should not, in fairness be called upon to make up for its deficiency. If, he had had any doubts, as to the necessity of such a clause, they would have been completely removed by an occurrence that had since taken place. From that occurrence, he was fully convinced the difficulty was felt by Government, for an hon. Baronet who had recently accepted office, and had thereby vacated his seat, applied to his electors and begged them to give a practical refutation to the argument, that official men were not likely to obtain seats when nomination boroughs were done with. He was re-elected on this assurance, but from that moment he had subjected the whole of his political conduct to the supervision of his constituency. How, then, could security for any consistent line of policy in the Government be obtained, when in the event of a dissolution of Parliament, each Minister must depend upon the caprice of popular opinion, consequent probably on the excitement of a general election, for his return to Parliament? It was to him quite inexplicable how ingress to the House for Ministers was to be procured. The noble Lord who had last addressed the House had said, that their Lordships were menaced with a half measure of Reform in the event of the rejection of that whole measure—and a whole one it unquestionably was—which they were discussing. It was true that the noble Duke behind him had stated his intention of proposing a Reform Bill, in case the present was rejected; but the consideration of that measure was not intended, and ought not to be considered in the light of a menace. The announcement of such an intention, however, would have one good effect, for it resolved the question for their Lordships' consideration into this, whether should the consistency of his Majesty's Ministers or the consistency of their Lordships' House be preserved? Any noble Lord who was disposed to vote for Reform, but not for the Bill which Ministers had introduced, had now an opportunity of doing so through the announcement which the noble Duke had made. Should those noble Lords who were in favour of moderate Reform suffer the Bill before them to be read a second time, they would place themselves in a position from which, they would find it difficult to withdraw, for they, by such a vote, would be assenting to the principles of Reform as proposed by his Majesty's Ministers, and not to the principles of moderate Reform. For his own part, under no circumstances could he give his support to the principle of a measure, every clause of which, to be rendered palatable, should be altered in Committee. He would not further detain their Lordships, as he knew there were so many individuals around him far more competent to express to the House the objections which those noble Lords who sat on its opposite side entertained to the measure.

Earl *Bathurst* said, the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had referred to his remarks on presenting the petition from the University of Oxford, and had argued that the objections urged by the petitioners against the 10*l.* clause had been completely overturned in former debates, particularly by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. But that noble and learned Lord did not seem himself to place much confidence in that declaration, for he had admitted, that the 10*l.* franchise might be altered without impairing the main principles of the Bill. A contrary doctrine, however, had since been promulgated by his colleagues elsewhere—he presumed, in deference to the opinions of their supporters out of doors—a doctrine, indeed, not only opposed to the statement of the learned Lord, but to the recorded opinions of the same individuals themselves on former occasions. He particularly referred to the conduct of the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the occasion of a motion for Reform—a transfer to Leeds of the franchise of a corrupt borough—during the debate on which, that noble Lord's present colleague (Lord Milton), to express his strong dissent from the proposition to make 10*l.* the minimum rate of franchise qualification, moved, as an amendment, that the votes be taken by "scot and lot, according to the wise custom of our ancestors." That amendment was seconded by Lord Althorp, who declared, in emphatic terms, that he contemned the proposition of a 10*l.* qualification. Lord Milton stated at the time, that he was authorised to say that the people of Leeds were decidedly averse to the proposition for admitting every man rated at 10*l.* to the right of voting, as they conceived that so low a rate would defeat the benefits contemplated by franchising their town. The same opinion was acted upon by Lords Milton and Althorp, with respect to the proposition for transferring the franchise from Penryn to Manchester, in which they were soon after joined by Lord John Russell, the orginator of the proposition. When the question was first mooted in the Commons, Sir George Phillips rose in his place, and said, that, as one particularly well acquainted with the feelings of the people of Manchester, he felt it but his duty to deprecate so low a rate of franchise as 10*l.* being adopted in that town; that the inhabitants themselves were averse to any rate less than 20*l.*, or 15*l.* at the very lowest. In the next session, Lord John Russell altered the rate to 20*l.*, in obedience, as he stated, to the wishes and feelings of the people of Manchester and Leeds themselves. And yet, in the teeth of these emphatic declarations, their Lordships were then called upon to pledge themselves to a 10*l.* qualification, because the political unions had so willed it. These unions, which were now so powerful, had originally been assemblies of the operative classes, combined nominally for the rendering of temporary assistance to their brother tradesmen, but, in reality, for the purpose of from time to time compelling their masters to raise their wages. They took their rise from the unfortunate period of the repeal of the Combination Act, and had gone on from step to step. They were in union and combination with each other, and they never all struck at one time, but encouraged one or two to strike, while the rest remained able to pay them their wages; and when the masters were compelled to succumb in one instance, then the others said, "Why do you not act in the same way by us as by those who struck, or is it only because we have not done like them?" These unions began to take a political turn when that bill was brought in to transfer the franchise of East Retford to Birmingham. All the alteration in the present Bill would, he contended, be but as a bonus to these unions, more especially that which enabled the 10*l.* householder, though removing from one house to another, to vote on the simple proof of his holding premises to that value. They all had active agents amongst this class of 10*l.* householders, who would take care, that wherever new Members were given, and more especially in the great manufacturing towns, their friends should have the votes of those householders. It might, no doubt, be said, that every one who voted should prove his right to do so: but this was futile; for who would take upon himself the invidious task of inquiring whether these men had paid their rates or their rents? In short this clause would practically place all the elections in the hands of these political unions—of those who tyrannized over their masters, and contrived to raise wages at their pleasure. He would not trespass on the House after the able speech of the noble Baron who proposed the Amendment, further than to say, that the first and second clauses of the present Bill were much more grievous, and would make the Bill infinitely more injurious than the former Bill, which had been rejected by their Lordships. In the present Bill the number of boroughs to be disfranchised was fixed in the body of the Bill. They were called upon to vote absolutely that schedule A was to contain fifty-six boroughs, and schedule B thirty. These places were to be wholly or partially disfranchised, not because they were nomination boroughs, for, by extending the boundaries of many of them, there could be found at least as good a constituency as in many of the new boroughs; but the framers of the Bill were determined to get 144 Representatives to divide, at their good pleasure, among counties and manufacturing towns: and therefore they had arbitrarily declared, they would admit no decreased number in the schedules, although they contained more than in their former Bill. On the last occasion Ministers had selected all the great manufacturing towns, and certainly between October and December it was not possible that such a change could have taken place as would entitle a town, in December, to have two Members, which, in October, was only to have one; and besides, the principle of spoliation was sanctioned, not only for the purpose of giving Members to England, but also to give eight to Scotland, and five to Ireland. And, in giving five Members to Ireland, was it possible, that, looking to the population of England and Ireland, five Members were all they would give the latter in addition?—and if, as the noble Viscount said, he hated half measures, they intended to do justice, ought they not to give Ireland at least as many additional Members as Scotland? On the whole, he opposed the Bill, not because it was a measure of Reform, but because, instead of reforming, it destroyed the constituency of the country; and although, in early life, he had given a vote in favour of some change in the Representation, he did so on the principles—first, that the number of Members of the House of Commons should continue unchanged—and secondly, that no borough should be disfranchised without proof of corruption. He believed that the public interest had been more frequently sacrificed from the fear of being reproached for the want of consistency than from a departure from it warranted by circumstances.

The Earl of *Haddington* said, that having been all his life opposed to Parliamentary Reform, and having given effect to that feeling and to that opinion when the late Bill was under the consideration of their Lordships' House, he felt, what he thought their Lordships must feel, not an unnatural anxiety to vindicate his own consistency, by shortly stating the reasons which induced him on the present occasion not to oppose the second reading of the Bill then under their consideration. Their Lordships might rest assured that his statement would be short, for having for some time been labouring under severe indisposition, he was physically incapable, even if he had the disposition to address them at any length. Many of those with whom he was in communication upon the second reading of the last Bill, could bear witness that until within a very few days of the discussion in that House he was in his own mind very much disposed to think that the Bill should then be read a second time —not because the principles contained in that Bill coincided with the views and principles for which he had ever contended, but because he thought that Reform upon principle and expediency had become, however great and tremendous an evil, absolutely necessary and irresistible. Under that impression, he thought that the sooner the question was settled by a calm and deliberate discussion of its details, and the sooner that the obnoxious parts of the measure were removed, the better it would be for the country. Those were his opinions at the time that the last Bill was brought forward for the second reading; and if he abandoned them, and gave effect to the sentiments of his own mind, which had ever been opposed to Reform, it was because he was in communication with others, who, seeing the spirit which then prevailed in the country, in the other House of Parliament, and on both sides of their Lordships' House, felt perfectly satisfied that anything like an amendment of the Bill would be impossible. There were other considerations which also contributed to bring his mind to vote against the second reading of the last Bill. He felt, in common, he believed, with every well-thinking man, the greatest possible indignation at the manner in which the Members of their Lordships' House were treated by the public Press, at public meetings of every sort and every description. He was indignant at the personal intimidation which was held out against them, and he was satisfied that the respectable classes of the community were indignant also. He did not mean to say, that his feelings upon that insult had strength enough alone to influence his vote; but he certainly did think that the tone of the Press at that time ought not to be disregarded. The example of the noble Duke behind him (the Duke of Wellington) was held up to them as that which they should follow. They were told, that had that noble Duke listened to such arguments as influenced them upon this question of Reform, the great measure which was deemed necessary for the peace and tranquillity of Ireland would never have been carried. But, when that great measure was under discussion, no such intimidation as that which had been used since the question of Reform had been in agitation was held out against the noble Duke. He was told, it was true, that if he did not concede the measure of Catholic Emancipation, Ireland would continue in an unsettled and distracted state, and that ultimately he would be compelled to hold that country by the sword, or to consent to a separation of the Union. But that was not the sort of argument that had been advanced against such of their Lordships as were opposed to the measure for Parliamentary Reform. The argument used against them was of a far more personal character. Every claim to honesty or integrity was denied to them. Their opposition to Reform was founded upon the most selfish motives; the pride of their order—the love of property—in short, all the common and vulgar motives that could be supposed to influence men were attributed to them, as the ground of the conduct which they pursued. Then followed a series of intimidations to fright them from the performance of what they believed to be their duty. Of late he had neither seen nor heard of anything of that kind. It had been found out, he presumed, that arguments of that sort were not likely to have the weight desired with those to whom they were addressed; and, therefore, they had been disused. It also appeared to him, when the second reading of the last Bill was proposed, that their Lordships were called upon, in the exercise of the conservative duty which they owed to the country, not at a moment—the first moment—of agitation of an unparalleled excitement to yield, and by their vote to sanction, without, as he thought, any hope of amendment —at all events, with very slender hopes of amendment—the principles of a Bill involving such tremendous consequences. It occurred to him that it would become their Lordships to stay for awhile the flood that had set in, or, at all events, to appeal from the warm and passionate opinions of the Ministry to the deliberate judgment of the country. Their Lordships did make that appeal, and what had been the result? They had heard of re-action—re-action had over and over again been promised to them. Would to God that they had seen it! He believed, indeed, that the excitement had greatly subsided, but that there had been any re-action, could not be reasonably affirmed. He was one of those who had never believed the statements that had been made of the unanimity of the country upon this question. He was always quite certain that the country was divided upon it—he was always certain that a great portion of the better classes of society were opposed to it. He believed that the rejection of the Bill on the last occasion had given courage to those persons to speak their minds upon the subject, and they had done so numerously and most respectfully. But he could not help thinking that, if their addresses were to be examined, however much the principles of this particular Bill might be deplored by the petitioners, still he could not help thinking if the addresses which had been laid upon their Lordships' Table were to be looked into, they would not be found—at least the greater number would not be found—to contain anything so hostile to the principle of Reform as would, in his mind, form the only safe and reasonable ground upon which their Lordships could be warranted in a second time refusing to go into Committee upon this Bill. His firm belief and persuasion was, that the reasonable and respectable part of the community were heartily tired of the business. He believed that they earnestly desired a settlement of the question. He believed that they wished their Lordships to amend the Bill; but he did not believe that they wished them to reject it without examination. He thought that if their Lordships rejected the Bill without examining its details, they would not have the support of those respectable parts of the community, to whose opinions they were bound at all times, and had been at all times, disposed to yield. It would, undoubtedly, have been much more agreeable to himself —to his long-cherished opinions, and old prejudices, and connexions, to have come down to that House, and have taken the same course that the noble Baron (Lord Ellenborough) had taken, and to have opposed, on reasonings similar to those which the noble Baron had urged, the further progress of this, he must say, most unhappy measure. But, in order to have done so, and in order to have acted with any consistency upon the same view of the case that had been taken by the noble Baron, he must necessarily be of opinion that it was possible to resist the cry of Reform. Would to God that it were so! If the noble Baron, the noble Duke, or any noble Lord upon that side of the House, would convince him that it could be done, he would pledge his vote even against the second reading of the Bill. But the noble Baron, he thought, would admit that the whole of his argument went in defence of the representative system as it then stood, and against any change whatever. The noble Baron had entered into a defence of the nomination boroughs; but did the noble Baron think—he did not say that he thought so—did he think that at this time of day it was possible that the nomination boroughs could be retained? The noble Baron could not promise—with the speech which he had made, and the sentiments which he had delivered—support to the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) behind him, if that noble Duke should have an opportunity of submitting to their Lordships' consideration the plan of Reform which he had in contemplation. The noble Duke, he believed, proposed to consolidate the representative system, and to destroy everything like an overwhelming influence; therefore he proposed to destroy nomination boroughs—he openly declared it to be his object to destroy nomination boroughs. But the speech of the noble Baron went directly in defence of nomination boroughs, and against this Bill, because it tended to do away with the check which boroughs of that description had hitherto afforded to the immediate voice of the people. The objections of the noble Baron, then, would hold as good against the measure of the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) as against that now under their consideration. The noble Baron, and the noble Earl who spoke last, had both of them, he thought, treated this Bill as if the 10*l.* clause were its vital principle. Now, he (Lord Haddington) objected to the 10*l.* clause as much as either of those noble Lords could do, though not, indeed, as regarded the small boroughs, with respect to which he thought the noble Baron behind him had not drawn the distinction that in justice he ought to have done. To that clause of the Bill, however, he would not pledge himself, although he thought that in small boroughs the 10*l.* qualification would produce a very respectable class of voters. But if the great mass of democracy, which by the Bill, as it then stood, would be thrown into the constituency of the kingdom, was to be brought into full and fatal activity; if, to use the denomination which had been applied to them elsewhere, these ten-pounders were to be admitted to the right of voting, not only in all the new boroughs created in schedules C and D, but also in all the old boroughs of the kingdom; if that were to be the case, then he did think that the description which the noble Baron had given of its effects was quite unanswerable. But the 10*l.* qualification did not stand in the principle of the Bill. The noble Marquis who spoke before the noble Earl, said that those who voted for the second reading of the Bill, would be bound to support all the principles of Ministers. He (Lord Haddington) begged leave utterly to deny that: or if the noble Marquis would make his proposition clear to him, he would not vote for the second reading of the Bill. Unless he thought that he had a chance—a fair prospect—of modifying the views of Ministers, he would not support them in this stage. The preamble of the Bill stated no more than what he contended must be the principle of any measure for Parliamentary Reform. In order to amend the Representation of the people, it stated that it was necessary to disfranchise, to enfranchise, and to extend the franchise. He (Lord Haddington) felt that they had now arrived at a time at which they could not refuse to enfranchise—at which they could not refuse to disfranchise—and at which they could not refuse to extend the right of voting. In supporting the second reading of the Bill, every 'man had a right to be judged by his own declaration. He (Lord Haddington) pledged himself to nothing more than what the words in the preamble necessarily conveyed. He reserved to himself the right of taking in Committee whatever course to him should seem good—and to support whatever amendment should seem to him calculated to improve the Bill, and to diminish the many dangers with which, in its present shape, he deemed it pregnant. In taking the course which he had pointed out, to which he had brought his mind most unwillingly, he felt himself obliged to consider what were the dangers before him in any part that he might be called upon to pursue. They were living at a moment, and were legislating upon a subject, on which it unluckily happened that the choice was not, and he feared could not, be between good and evil—it was a balance of practical evils. He could not conceal from himself the evil of allowing the Bill to be read a second time; but it was upon the most anxious consideration of the balance of practical evil on this side, and on the other, that he had been induced to think that it would become their Lordships—aye, even as the conservative branch of the Legislature—to go into Committee, and to examine the details of this Bill. He had no sanguine views upon the subject. He did not feel that it would be possible for their Lordships to replace the much-decayed rotten boroughs, which it was one of the objects of the Bill to destroy, and to restore that balance which was by them created in the House of Commons, as against the pure exercise of the popular principle. But he did not see the impossibility of at least giving such a weight to property as would, in a great measure, maintain the balance as it had hitherto existed, and, as was well expressed by a noble friend of his, who said a few words on the first reading, "at least so many planks of the vessel may be saved as to enable us to float on in tranquillity and peace." But did not noble Lords see what must be the issue of rejecting the Bill? The ultimate end of a rejection of the measure would only operate as a means to rivet the whole Bill, or even a worse one, upon them—one at least as strong, and carried by a revolutionary spirit throughout the country. In what condition would their Lordships and the Monarchy be then? He saw no possibility of escape from this dilemma, save by an attempt to alter and amend the Bill in Committee. If they could do this, they would deserve the gratitude of the country; and if not, and still made the attempt, they could, if obliged, throw it out with a better grace on the third reading, and go with a better case for themselves before the country. The country would then see that the charge was false, that they did not sympathize with the country; that they were ready to concede much, but not so much as would be injurious to the Monarchy. The country had now been for a long period in a state of agitation and excitement—the people had been filled with exaggerated and delusive hopes—the commerce of the country was stagnant—her trade was stationary—every sort of enterprise was checked—and that good humour and that cheerful disposition for which the people of England had been hitherto distinguished, had received a deep, he hoped not a deadly, wound. In mentioning these circumstances—circumstances which they must all deplore—he did not refer to them by any means as reasons for the passing of such a Bill as that now before their Lordships; but he would say, that they furnished strong arguments to show that it was the duty of their Lordships to endeavour to throw oil on the troubled waves, to endeavour to calm that agitation which at present prevailed, and to endeavour, by going into Committee, by there considering the details of this measure, and by affording in that manner an earnest of their anxiety to give to the people that kind of Reform which would appear to them safe and practicable, to allay the excitement, and satisfy the wishes of the people of this country. To him it appeared that this great question must be settled by a compromise. Now, he thought that the people of this country were at this present moment in a temper of mind to render a compromise of that description practicable. Looking, too, at what had taken place in that House that evening, he was happy to say, that he thought that that House was at present in such a temper of mind; he thought that Parliament was in such a temper; and, for his part, he could see no reason why any man—why any one of their Lordships (except, indeed, those, if any such there should be amongst them, who took their stand upon the existing system)—he saw no reason why any one of their Lordships who admitted that they now must have a Reform embracing enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and an extension of the right of voting, could hesitate to come to a compromise of that kind. He did not know how the most important and influential opponent of the present Bill—he meant the noble Duke behind him (the Duke of Wellington)—felt on this subject. If, however, he understood the noble Duke rightly, he understood him on a former evening to say, that seeing that the King's name had been used in putting forward such a measure as this—seeing that the Government of the country had pledged itself to such a measure—and seeing that the public mind had been greatly excited with regard to it—he was ready to admit that there must be some Reform. He thought he had heard the noble Duke make that admission, and, if the noble Duke had done so, he saw no reason on earth why the noble Duke, taking into account the difficulties under which the country laboured, should be indisposed to entertain a proposition of that description. He was equally unable to discover any reason why the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government should not be in the same disposition, and be ready to meet the noble Duke on similar terms. The name and authority of the Crown surely could not be used against such a compromise, or against any limitation of the extent of this Bill, which their Lordships, upon due consideration of the details of the measure, might deem it fit to make in it. What the noble Earl owed to his Sovereign surely would not be looked upon by him as any bar against his giving a due and respectful attention to what might be suggested to him by the Members of that House. As little could it be contended that the rights of the people presented any bar against the introduction of such amendments as their Lordships might deem it wise to make in this Bill. Amongst the arguments urged by many of those who advocated this Bill, he would say that nothing could be more mischievous than the doctrines which they promulgated on the subject of the rights of the people. He would, on that point, adhere to what had been stated in the month of October, 1830, by the noble Earl now at the head of his Majesty's Government. On the day that the Session was then opened, that noble Earl, after stating that he was friendly to a temperate Reform, and after stating his reasons for being so, proceeded to discuss the questions whether every man who paid taxes, and every man who was of full age, had a right to participate in the choice of Members of the Legislature; and in reference to such doctrines, the noble Earl said, 'These are principles which I deny, and 'claims which I must oppose. The right 'of the people is to good Government, and 'that is, in my judgment, inconsistent with 'Universal Suffrage under our present in'stitutions. If Suffrage be the right of 'all who pay a certain tax, then I say, 'that it is in limit, and not in the exten'sion of that privilege, that such right 'consists.'* Such were the sentiments then expressed by the Earl, and he was, therefore, certain that the noble Earl would agree with him in denying and deprecating those monstrous doctrines to which he had alluded, and which had been so much dwelt upon of late, with respect to the pretended abstract rights of the people. He thought, that after the expression of such sentiments, the noble Earl would agree with him in the opinion, that the people had no more a right to any specific measure of Reform, or to any specific right of voting, than that every man who was of full age, or who paid taxes, had a right to participate in the choice of Members of the Legislature. The people, it was true, had a right to good Government; and, if Reform was necessary for good Government, they had, so far as it was for that purpose necessary, a right to Reform. He would just read to their Lordships an extract in point on this subject of abstract rights, from the posthumous publication of a very eminent foreigner, recently deceased. He alluded to M. Dumont, who, in the first French Revolution, was a witness of the scenes then going on in Paris, and who was a member of the celebrated National Convention. He was present when the famous declaration of rights was drawn up in that assembly; he saw the folly, the absurdity, and the falsehood, of it, and, speaking of it in this recent publication, his words were—'I felt 'the inconsistency and ridicule of a work 'which was only a puerile fiction. A de'claration of rights could be made only 'after the framing of the Constitution, 'and as one of its consequences; for rights 'exist in virtue of laws, and, therefore, do 'not precede them. The maxims sanctioned 'by this declaration *i. e.*, the principles in'tended to be established by it—are dan'gerous in themselves; for legislators 'should not be tied down to general pro'positions which they are afterwards 'obliged to alter or modify; above all, 'they must not be cramped by false max'ims. Men are born free and equal—that 'is not true.' He (the Earl of Haddington) would apply the maxim which that extract contained to this Bill; and the same doctrine which M. Dumont applied to a declaration about non-existing and impracticable right, he would apply to this or to any other specific measure of Reform. He would maintain that the people had not any right to any specific details of a measure of Reform. If Reform should lead to good Government, the public had a right to it, but their right to the particular kind of Reform which should be selected for that purpose would only commence after such Reform should be passed. He was certain that the noble Earl opposite would not, upon any such grounds, resist a compromise. He was satisfied, also, that if they would go into Committee, and, if they would there yield mutually on both sides, and endeavour to make the Bill as good as they could, that, under the existing circumstances of the country, they might be likely to agree upon a measure which would answer the reasonable expectations of all, and that the result would be, that they would receive from the people a tribute of gratitude such as no Parliament ever received before. He was anxious thus early in this discussion to state to their Lordships the grounds on which, with much reluctance, he had brought his mind to vote for the second reading of this Bill. As to the question of the noble Baron, who asked, where was the use of those who wished to alter the present Bill so much before it passed in voting for its going into Committee, he would answer that interrogatory by another question, and it was this—looking at the state of the country, and the necessity which they all felt, and which no man would deny, that Parliament must, to a certain extent, be Reformed, where was the use, on the part of their Lordships, of a second time resisting the second reading of the Reform Bill?

The Earl of *Wicklow* said, that, having been one of those who, in a previous Session had voted against the second reading of a Bill similar to this one, if he had since come to the determination to vote for this present Bill going into Committee, he certainly should, after the speech which had been just delivered by the noble Earl, satisfy himself by giving a silent vote on the subject. Knowing as he did the talents and powers of the noble Earl, he was convinced that, if it were possible by any arguments to reconcile his mind to such an extraordinary change, that noble Lord would have adduced them. He would appeal to any noble Lord on either side of the House, whether they were not perfectly satisfied as to the result of the arguments adduced by his noble friend, and whether they did not agree with him (the Earl of Wicklow) that, after the speech which his noble friend had made, he was at perfect liberty to vote in any manner that he pleased with regard to the Bill. If any arguments were wanted to induce those on that side of the House to continue that opposition which they had hitherto given to this measure they were to be found in what had fallen from the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government. That noble Earl had acknowledged that this Bill was a considerable improvement on the Bill of last Session. Now, those who, by their vote on that occasion, produced such good effects by the rejection of the Reform Bill then, were called upon, by the prospect of effecting still greater good, and still further improvement, to vote for the rejection of the present measure. He (the Earl of Wicklow) voted against the second reading of the Reform Bill last Session, because he abhorred the principle of it; and, on the same grounds, he was determined to vote against the second reading of this Bill now before their Lordships. If, indeed, he were driven to the alternative of selecting one of those two measures, he was ready to acknowledge, that, for his part he would prefer the Bill of last Session. They had not heard a single argument to show that this measure would work well or that it possessed any decided advantages over the system which they at present enjoyed. No proof was adduced from the history of that or of any other country to show that a system founded on such principles was conducive to the public weal. The main and principle argument which the advocates of this measure brought forward in support of it, related to the evils which they prognosticated from its rejection. They threatened them, as the result of such an event, with civil war, with general confusion, and with a confiscation of all property. If such were the dangers to which they were exposed, he would say for one, that it was, therefore, the more incumbent on them to adhere more strictly to that course which their conviction and their conscience had in the first instance determined them to adopt. But they were told that the people would have the Bill. His Majesty's Ministers told them so, because they were told so by their masters at the public Press. But if it was the determination of those persons that such a measure as this should be carried, it was the duty of their Lordships on the other hand, to stem the popular torrent, and to calm the popular heat. His great objection to this measure arose from the manner in which it was likely to affect that part of the United Kingdom with with which he was immediately connected. He had not met with a single individual who, whatever might be his opinion with regard to Reform, could view the subject without apprehension as far as it regarded Ireland. To see what this measure would effect in Ireland, it was necessary to cast back a retrospective view on the system of Government which had been carried on in Ireland from the period of the Reformation to the present day. He could assure their Lordships that he meant to go into no detail on that point. All he meant to do was, to call their Lordships' attention to the course of policy which had been pursued towards Ireland during that time. The whole course of that policy had been the maintenance of the Protestant interest in that country. There were two occasions when that course was departed from. The first was during the agitation which preceded the civil war in the reign of Charles 1st. On that occasion the Protestants of Ireland applied to England for support. Kind words were then, as now, lavished upon them; ample promises were then, as now, given them of support; but on that occasion, as on the present, the attention of those who possessed the powers of the Government here was solely devoted to the carrying of a system of their own. Ireland was neglected, and the result was a civil war, universal desolation, and the rebellion of 1641; and peace was only finally restored in that country by the blood-stained march of Cromwell throughout its provinces. The second occasion occurred in the time of James 2nd. Similar applications from the Protestant interest in Ireland met with similar disregard here, and the consequence was, that peace was never restored until the resettlement and reconquest of that country by William 3rd. Again at the period of the Union, the arguments adduced to persuade the Parliament in both countries to agree to it was, that it was the only measure to preserve the Protestant interest in Ireland, by the preservation of the Protestant corporations and boroughs as a counteraction to the growing weight and influence of the Catholic interest there, the measure now before the House by throwing open those Protestant boroughs, removed the support which they had hitherto given to the Protestant interest in Ireland. He did not wish to prolong religious or party feelings in Ireland, and he believed that, abstractedly, a Roman Catholic could be as good a subject as any other; but party feelings did exist there; it was impossible, indeed, that they could all at once subside, and he believed that party excitement was never greater there than it was at this moment. Now the consequence of the passing of this measure would be, that there would be no resisting those demagogues who were at the head of a party, the object of which was, to obtain a repeal of the Union. When the Protestant boroughs were thrown open, those demagogues would obtain such power and such force that they would soon achieve a repeal of the Legislative Union. To those who would purchase Reform even at that price, he would say that with a Repeal of the Union, a complete separation of the two countries must inevitably soon follow. A Whig Government in 1782 granted to Ireland a legislative independence, and the history of Ireland from that period to the time of the Union, showed that, with separate Legislatures it would be impossible to maintain the connexion of the two countries for any length of time. He would refer their Lordships to the words which recently fell from a very eloquent Member of the other House of Parliament, and, which, though they might be dressed in the tinsel of eloquence, conveyed a salutary warning to his Majesty's Government. Here the noble Earl read the following passage from the speech of Mr. Sheil in the House of Commons, on the Irish tithes:—“ Infatuated men! what are you doing? Look before you, you are walking blindfold upon the brink of a gulf. You will exasperate Ireland — you will array the nation against you; then will come a general election in November; Reform will have thrown the close boroughs open; the democracy will have become gigantic—then will the people have their revenge. The poisoned chalice will, in just retribution, return to your own lips. It is your turn this Session, but it will be ours the next. What are you doing? Succouring a clergy from which you expect nothing—affronting and irritating a nation from which you look for much—opening the boiling fountain of popular indignation, leaguing a nation against you by your threats of coercion. We have served and supported you, and stood by you in many an emergency, and have received your praise for our zeal, our vigilance, our devotion to your interest—but alas, what can we do for you in the hurricane of popular passion, which you are about to raise? Our voices in your behalf will be like the whispers in a tempest, our arms are not strong enough to swim against the tide that knows no returning ebb, and if we attempt it we shall be swept before it. Reform! an election in November, and Ireland exasperated for the sake of certain persons of the establishment! Awake! you are on a precipice, and you must be rudely shaken, to rouse you from your perilous slumbers.”* These were the words of a gentleman, than whom there was no one better acquainted with the feelings and the opinions of that party in Ireland with whom he was connected. He knew not whether those words had been uttered inadvertently, or whether they were intended to prevent the Government from plunging into that gulf into which it seemed to be hastening; but at all events he trusted that the warning which they contained would not be lost on their Lordships. Though this measure would introduce, if passed, a great change into this country, yet so much good sense, and so much good feeling existed amongst the people here, that the evil effects of it would soon subside, and they might eventually look forward to peace and tranquillity; but the case was different as regarded Ireland. If this measure should be passed, the separation of Ireland from the British connexions would be the consequence, and it required no prophetic spirit to foretel, under such circumstances, the fall of this country. Impressed as he was with these sentiments he would conclude by declaring his determination to vote again, as he had done before—against the second reading of the Bill.

---

* Hansard's Debates, 3rd Series, vol. 1 p. 38.

Viscount *Gage* could not but confess that circumstances were so changed with respect to the Bill now before their Lordships, and that which was before the House in October last, that they were placed in a situation of more than ordinary difficulty, and probably it would be most prudent to pursue the line of conduct recommended by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government, and agree to allow the Bill to be read a second time. He had no doubt that that which was safe before was not so now, neither would it be prudent. In October last their Lordships had proved they had the power to stop the progress further of the Reform Bill. He confessed he thought they possessed that power no longer, and if they were to continue to oppose the Bill their resistance would have the fatal effect of precipitating its adoption by the Legislature, whilst they would lose the power they still, he thought, possessed of improving the provisions of the Bill in the Committee. That House, he firmly believed would, were it alone concerned, not hesitate to do what it had done before, and offer a stern opposition to the Bill but the state of society required at their hands a deviation from the strict line of consistency, so that they might be able to avail themselves of the only chance which might be afforded of pruning the measure of some of its more objectionable enactments, or improving it by adding to it suitable amendments at a future stage. Whilst their post was tenable their Lordships could not have ever consented to abandon it. He must repeat that they in order to arrive at the period when that improvement might be attempted with any hope of success, must assent now to the progress of the Bill through the present stage, or else they would lose that chance which he feared would not present itself were they to display a resolute opposition to the Bill; and the Bill would be forced, as it were upon the adoption of the Legislature, without any chance of improvement, owing to the temper of the times. That chance they would do well not to neglect, for if they did so, they, he feared, would not fail to become the dupes of their attempt to maintain a character for consistency. He should, therefore, recommend even those who formerly had opposed the measure of last year, to permit the Bill to go through a second reading, and take the chance of rendering it less objectionable in the future stages by prudent amendments and curtailment. If, however, they were disappointed in that attempt, they would even then have the consolation of reflecting that in this instance they had made some sacrifice of character, respected their consistency, in the hope of conferring a benefit on society, by modifying a measure so loudly called for by certain classes in society; and had done their utmost though in vain, to accommodate it to the real interests of the public.

---

* See Hansard's Parl. Debates, vol. x. pp. 1345-6

The Marquis of *Londonderry* assured their Lordships it was not his intention long to trespass on their time in repeating arguments which had been urged with so much eloquence by the noble Lord who had addressed them on the same side of the question which he found himself compelled to advocate. He had not addressed them at an earlier hour because he was desirous of hearing what were the arguments on which the noble Earl, who spoke the last but two, intended to defend his changeof opinion on this vital question. The noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government proposed a Bill last year, which was lost in that House, and it would be recollected the noble Earl subsequently pledged himself not to depart in the new Bill he should propose from the principle of the last, and in substance declared it was his intention to stand or fall by that principle of Reform; so that the measure of 1832 should be in all respects as full, as ample, and as effectual, as that of 1831, upon each of the great leading features of Reform—namely, enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and qualification of voters. On all these points, then, the noble Earl had announced that it was not his intention to give way. If so, then their Lordships, he would contend, were bound, if they wished to maintain their consistency, either as individuals or as a part of the Legislature, to vote against the measure, for the very reason that the noble Earl supported it—namely, that it was as full, ample, and effectual a measure of Reform as that which they had formerly negatived. He confessed that he was, for these precise reasons, the more surprised to find the noble Earl who spoke last but two avow to-night that he was most reluctantly obliged to go against the opinion he had formerly given. He was but little disposed to give any weight to the reasoning of that noble Earl who could accompany such an avowal of his compulsory change of sentiment with the statement that he wished to God he could have seen a reaction. Now that which the noble Earl wished to see, but professed he could not, was, he thought, perfectly and distinctly visible to any man who looked even carelessly and superficially at the result of the late elections, since that question had been agitated out of doors with so much intense interest. In the returns made of Members to Parliament, he believed he could make out his assertion that a very strong demonstration had been made of a reaction or change in public opinion.

Since the last Bill the following changes had taken place in the Representation:—

	GENERAL ELECTION.	LAST ELECTION.
Cambridgeshire . . .	Lord F. Osborne, *Reformer*	Mr. Townley, *Reformer*
Carmarthen	*No return*	Mr. Jones, *Tory*
Dorsetsetshire	Mr. Calcraft, *Reformer*	Lord Ashley, *Tory*
Grimsby.	Capt. Harris, Mr. Shelley, } *Tories*	Capt. Fitzroy, Loughborough } *Tories*
Leominster.	Mr. Bryan, *Reformer*	Lord Hotham, *Tory*
Pembrokeshire	Sir J. Owen, *Tory*	Sir J. Owen, *Tory*
Poole.	Mr. Ponsonby, *Reformer*	Sir J. Byng, *Reformer*
Liverpool	Mr. Denison, *Reformer*	Lord Sandon, *Tory*
Wallingford	Colonel Hughes, *Reformer*	Mr. Leigh, *Reformer*
Weymouth.	Major Weyland, *Reformer*	Mr. B. Wall, *Tory*
Forfarshire.	Mr. Maule, *Reformer*	Col. Ogilvie, *Tory*
Dublin.	Mr. Harty, Mr. Perrin, } *Reformers*	Mr. Shaw, Lord Ingestrie, } *Tories*
Meath.	Sir M. Somerville, *Reformer*	Mr. H. Grattan, *Reformer*

Thus it would be seen that at these places the people had returned four Reformers and eleven anti-Reformers, a pretty strong proof, in his opinion, of a change in the public sentiment. He would not, on this occasion, urge his own opinions against the Bill, he would look up to higher authority, and shape his course by the advice of the eminent persons who had opposed the former measure with such eloquence and effect; deeply was he distressed at seeing those noble Lords now departing from those manly and honourable opinions, which they themselves had urged with so much force and truth, and by whose opinions, so many of their Lordships had been influenced. The speech of a noble Earl in particular, (the Earl of Harrowby) which was afterwards published, was so uncontrovertible in argument, and so eloquent in expression, that he was wholly at a loss to conceive how that noble Earl could reconcile it to himself to vote for the second reading of a Bill (as he understood it was that noble Earl's intention to do, from the few remarks he had addressed to their Lordships on the first reading of the present Bill) very nearly similar in its character to that which he had been mainly instrumental in inducing their Lordships to reject on a former occasion. He could not resist the temptation to quote the noble Earl's sentiments, he had said. "I do not wish to follow the noble Earl into the details of this Bill; but I think, if it were a Bill fit to go into Committee, that some of the objectionable parts of its details (if we can talk of anything in this Bill as a detail) are capable of correction. But shall I, on that ground, consent to its going into a Committee? I think not, if I am satisfied that the principle of the measure is bad. I believe the principle on which the whole of this Bill is founded to be such, that no amendments made in the Committee can so remove the objections to it as to make it our duty to pass it into a law."* This embraced the opinions which he (Lord Londonderry) entertained in reference to this Bill. No amendment could be made in it which could induce him to adopt the principle which it involved. In the same speech he found the noble Earl asking, "Are your Lordships prepared to make an entire change in the whole Representative system, simply upon the conjectures of the noble Earl? No; this is my objection—I oppose any measure which proposes to alter everything. Amend it as you may, leave uninjured all the ancient rights, which are so wantonly to be destroyed, simply directing your disfranchisement against those boroughs which are incontestably nomination boroughs. Ought we to be satisfied? Would Ministers stand blameless? No: the injury is irremediable—I do not speak of passing, but of proposing a plan of universal demolition and universal re-construction."† This description of the Bill appeared to him (the Marquis of Londonderry) equally applicable now, but, perhaps, the following paragraph of that speech, might, with propriety, be addressed to the noble Lord himself, and other noble Lords, who proposed to follow his example and vote for the second edition of that Bill which they had formerly rejected. "If the patience of your Lordships could endure, I could make the longest and the best speech that was ever made in or out of Parliament against the second reading of this Bill, without spoiling it by the admixture of a single thought or word of my own, merely by repeating the speeches and writings of those who are its proposers or supporters."* For himself he had several grounds of objection to the measure:—first, it failed to procure to each class a distinct and adequate Representation; next, it did not bestow Representation on the worthier and better classes in society; and, thirdly, it appeared to be framed so as to insure benefit more especially to an objectionable class of voters. In fine it would not, however specious it appeared, improve the Representation of the people. In what situation, he would ask, was the empire at present placed? They had a falling revenue—a discontented people—the inhabitants of Ireland were distracted—our West-India colonies were in open insurrection—our foreign relations were distracted—and all these unhappy consequences had arisen since the period when the noble Earl had taken upon himself the conduct of the Government of this country; and, he considered, that the passing of this measure would form the climax of all evils. He had upon a former occasion stated his reasons which then induced him to vote against the second reading of the Reform measure; and he must declare that these reasons still existed in the present case. His opinion was backed too by an authority which noble Lords on the other side would not dispute; and though he had already read various extracts, he could not refrain from adding this, as it was most apt on the occasion. He would quote the passage, to show that the individual from whom the observations had emanated was a judge of what the rights of the people consisted. The noble Marquis then read an extract from a speech of Mr. Fox as follows. "We are bound to support the true interests of the people in preference to the desires of their hearts; and the Constitution makes us the sole arbiters of those interests, notwithstanding the imaginary infallibility of the people. Shall we sacrifice our reason, our honour, and our conscience, for fear of incurring the popular resentment, and while we are appointed to watch the Hesperian fruit of liberty with a dragon's eye, be ourselves the only slaves of the whole community? Perhaps I may be told that nothing but the 'soul of absurdity' could suspect the people of a design against their own happiness. I do not suspect the people of any such design, but I suspect their capacity to judge of their true happiness. I know they are generally credulous and generally uninformed, captivated by appearances, while they neglect the most important essentials, and always ridiculously ready to believe that those men who have the greatest reason, from their extensive property, to be anxious for the public safety, are always concerting measures for the oppression of their own posterity. I stand up for the Constitution, not for the people. If the people attempt to invade the Constitution, they are enemies to the nation. Being convinced, therefore, that we are to do justice, whether it is agreeable or disagreeable, I am for maintaining the independence of Parliament, and will not be a rebel to the King, to my country, or my own heart, for the loudest huzza of an inconsiderate multitude." Such were the sentiments of Mr. Fox, as appeared from the Parliamentary Journal.

---

* See Hansard, Third Series, vol. vii. p. 1157.

† Ibid. 1168.

Lord *Holland:* That was in the year 1771.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* believed it was. The speech, however, had made such an impression on his mind, that he could not avoid quoting it. A noble Baron (Wharncliffe) had said, in the last Session, that the day when he moved the rejection of the Reform Bill, he looked upon as the proudest day of his life. He hoped that the noble Baron would not depart from his consistency, and that he would give the same opposition to the present Bill, which he had offered to the former. A report had gone abroad, that the noble Earl opposite had declared that he held in his hands a power which would enable him to carry the Bill through that House. He could not conceive anything more unconstitutional than such a statement. This statement was put forth with the flimsy hope that it would deter some of their Lordships from doing their duty—and flimsy were all the arguments which had been adduced in support of the measure that had been hinted at. If there had been a negotiation on the subject of this Bill, let their Lordships know what that negotiation was, with whom it was carried on, and the points which it embraced. If the minds of noble Lords had been altered in private, let it be publicly made known on what grounds that alteration had been effected. For himself, he was not debarred nor deterred from stating every thing he heard, by delicacy, or any other feeling. Every Peer of the realm had a right and ought to speak out on this occasion; for the present was one of the greatest and most important questions that was ever brought before Parliament. It involved nothing less than a change in the whole Constitution. He had heard it stated that the noble Earl had made use of the influence of the King's name to bias the opinions of noble Lords. If such were the case, he would say, that the noble Earl's conduct was sufficient to induce an impeachment against him. No Minister ever had done, or ever could do, anything more unconstitutional than that. Talk of using the King's name in elections,—talk of exerting influence out of doors—what was that compared with this secret and private influence? If the Minister had exerted this influence privately, in his closet, as was rumoured out of doors, he was deeply responsible for his conduct. Such were the sentiments which he felt that he had a right to give vent to; and, feeling thus, he should offer his decided and most uncompromising opposition to this unhappy measure in every stage.

---

* See Hansard, Third Series, vol. vii. p. 1149.

Debate adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, April 9, 1832.

Minutes.] Bill brought in. By Mr. Robert Grant, for holding the Assizes for the County of Norfolk, and for the City of Norwich.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Hudson, of the Official and declared Value of the Imports to, and Exports from the United Kingdom, from and to each of the British Colonies and Possessions for two years, ending 5th January, 1831, and 1832; also, a like Account relating to all Foreign Countries, distinguishing each with the respective Amounts of British Colonial, and Foreign Produce:—On the Motion of Mr. Hume, from the Churchwardens of the Parish of St. Pancras, of the Number of Persons, on 17th March last, Rated to the Relief of the Poor; and also, of the Total Number of Declarations or Votes, delivered to the said Churchwardens for and against the Adoption of the Act passed in last Session, for the better Regulation of Vestries, &c.:—On the Motion of Mr. Briscoe, the Number of Licenses granted by the Excise, for the Retail of Spirituous Liquors within the Bills of Mortality, from the 5th of January, 1831, to 5th January, 1832; and all Coroners' Inquests held within the King's Bench Prison, and the Rules thereof, from the 1st of January, 1825, to the date of the Return within the year 1832; stating the date of each, the Name of the Deceased, and the Verdict; also, the Name of the Person acting as Coroner on each and every occasion so returned:—On the Motion of Mr. Lamb, for Summary Statements of the Number of Persons charged with Criminal Offences, who were committed to the different Gaols in England and Wales for Trial at the Assizes and Sessions, held for the several Counties, Cities, Towns, and Liberties therein, during the last seven years; distinguishing the Number in each year; and showing the Nature of the Crimes respectively of which they were Convicted, or Acquitted, and with which those were charged against whom no Bills were found, and who were not prosecuted; the Sentences of those Convicted, and the Number Executed who received Sentence of Death:—On the Motion of Mr. Spring Rice, of the quantity of Spirits consumed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, in 1831, compared with the previous year:—On the Motion of Mr. Burge, for Copy of the Protest of the West-India Merchants, transmitted to Viscount Goderich, of the 6th April last.

Petitions presented. By Viscount Duncannon, from Kilmaganny, Donemaggin, and Conahy; and by Mr. Maurice O'Connell, from the Landholders and Inhabitants of Cashel, Nurnay, and Clonmel, for the Abolition of Tithes; and from Roman Catholic Tradesmen of the Guild of Shoemakers Galway, for Provision in the Reform of Parliament (Ireland) Bill, for the peculiar Franchise of Galway:—By Sir William Ingilby, from William Hutton, Sheriff of the County of Lincoln, for Abolishing the Fees payable by Sheriffs on their Appointment to Office; and for the Repeal of so much of the Acts of 12 Richard 2nd., cap. 10, and 14 Richard 2nd., cap. 11, as relates to the Number of Justices for each County, and the Amount of Wages to be paid them, and to the Clerks of the Peace. By Mr. Benett, from the Agriculturists of Marlborough and Devizes, for the Repeal of the Duty on Malt:—By Mr. Sanford, from Wellington, Somersetshire, against the proposed Plan of Education in Ireland; from the Sailcloth Manufacturers and Flaxspinners at Yeovil, Crewkerne, and East and West Coker, against the Factories Regulation Bill; from the Landowners of Chard and Axbridge, against the General Registry Bill; and from Persons assembling in Zion Chapel Ilminster, for the Abolition of Slavery.

New System of Education (Ireland.)] Mr. *Strickland* presented a Petition, which was of much importance, as showing a great sympathy of the English in favour of the Irish: it was from Liversedge, in the West Riding of York, in favour of the Government system of Education in Ireland, signed by 1,425 persons, and agreed to by a public meeting, which was so numerous that it was obliged to be adjourned to the open air. The hon. Member thought that many of the objections made to the proposed plan were founded on mistake; he was sure that it would tend much towards the tranquillity and happiness of Ireland. He was sure, too, that the people of England would be glad to hear that the new system was likely to be generally adopted, and that there had already been 200 applications to the new Board for assistance. It was, in his opinion, certain that education would be more extensively diffused by the plan of the present Government than ever had been by the Kildare-place Society, which was well known to be obnoxious to a great portion of the Irish nation.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, he would now explain how this petition was got up. A meeting had been called by thirty clergymen, not for the discussion of affairs in general, but the invitation was limited to the friends of scriptural education for the purpose of agreeing to an address to the Throne. After the advertisement had been read, a number of the persons broke up the meeting by violence and uproar, and got up a meeting of their own, at which this petition was agreed to. He thought he might infer that the opinion of the well-informed persons was against the Government plan.

Sir *John Johnstone* said, the hon. Member was so complacent to the persons of his own party, that he confined all the sound thinking to that side. He saw no reason why the respectable persons who had signed the petition were not as fully competent to give an opinion as those who had called the meeting, but had been outvoted.

Mr. *Harvey* was surprised to hear so many objections to the proposed plan, and so many complaints against Government for taking the paltry annual grant of 15,000*l.* a-year from the Kildare-street Society, when he supposed that there was enough of Protestant virtue, and Protestant liberality in Ireland to make up that sum if they pleased, and so prevent the Kildare-street Society from perishing. It was not more than half of the annual income of some of the Bishops of Ireland, and why, therefore, should they complain of the Government when it was in their own power to perpetuate their favourite Kildare-street Society; for if they chose to keep up that establishment, it was not in the power of Government to prevent it. The fact, he believed, was that petitions against the new system were got up for party purposes, and not from any regard for the Scriptures or religion; but he was glad the people of England had shown more good sense than to be deceived by any such delusions.

Mr. *Wyse* said, the Protestant Church of Ireland was bound to educate their flocks, whom they entirely neglected. The want of education in Ireland was owing in a great degree to the Protestant clergy, into whose hands had fallen the funds originally destined for education. The present was a plan similar to those adopted throughout Europe, and found to be attended with advantage.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, that he must assert in opposition to the hon. Member for Tipperary, the character of the Protestant clergy of Ireland, and their zeal for the education of the people, were above all praise. The observation of the hon. member for Colchester was not founded on fact. The Bishops of Ireland had not 30,000*l.* a-year, and as to the sum of 15,000*l.* being collected by the Protestants, that had nothing to do with the matter. He begged to observe that it was not a question of pounds, shillings, and pence, but it concerned an excellent plan of religious education, to which his Majesty's Government had hitherto lent their countenance, but which they thought proper now to withdraw from it. He should shortly have occasion to present several petitions from very populous places against the Government plan.

Mr. *James Johnstone* said, that the Presbyterians had no objection to extracts from the Bible being used in preference to the book itself, provided the extracts were read in a proper place. He did not approve of discussions of this description, but he trusted that as it had been brought forward it would lead to a withdrawal of this obnoxious plan. It was perfectly clear, that it was any thing but satisfactory to the people of Ireland. The Synod of Ulster, a most intelligent body, had set their faces against it. The strongest feeling, too, against the proposed plan had manifested itself in Scotland, where several presbyteries had already met, and determined to petition the House against its adoption.

Mr. *James Grattan* denied that the great body of the Presbyterians in Ireland were opposed to the new plan of education. He trusted that it would be allowed a fair trial before it should be abandoned: he should propose two years at least. The old system had been tried for fifteen years, and was not found to answer. He, therefore, considered that a good argument in favour of the adoption of another scheme. He was quite certain that they would not be able to force the Scriptures on the people of Ireland by the plan acted upon by the Kildare-place Society. The advocates of that system pretended that their only motive for opposing the new system was, that it would encourage the Roman Catholic priesthood to prevent the reading of the scriptures altogether; they accused the Roman Catholics of proselytism, whilst they fell into precisely the same error themselves. He was sorry that these discussions were so frequent; however, they were calculated to bring the cause of religion into contempt, owing to the angry feelings of those who took part in them. He had supported the new plan, because he was quite satisfied that any other was useless to promote education in Ireland.

Mr. *Anthony Lefroy* was against the system proposed by the right hon. Secretary, and he was glad to say, that he was not alone in that opinion, but that he held it along with almost the whole Protestant population of Ireland. He might mention the petition which had been presented to the House from the United Synod of Ulster, a petition which he believed had passed unanimously. The objection that had been offered to the system pursued by the Kildare-street Society, viz. that the Bible was in some parts so obscure, that it ought not to be put into the hands of those who could not understand it, was not well founded, because it was left to the discretion of the master what portions were suited to the advanced state of the pupil.

Mr. *Shaw* had no wish to prolong the discussion upon this subject, but he wished to correct a few mistakes into which the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. D. W. Harvey) had fallen. he had said that there was only a sum of 15,000*l.* withdrawn from the Kildare-street Society. Now, the fact was, that the sum withdrawn was 25,000*l.* He (Mr. Shaw) did not complain of the withdrawal of that sum, for he considered that all such societies flourished more when left to private support; but what he complained of, and to which he must enter his protest, was, that Government had not merely withdrawn the grant, but had done so in order to give it to another body, and set up another system which in his opinion was not well founded. The hon. member for Tipperary (Mr. Wyse) seemed at all times ready to abuse the clergy of Ireland. Now, he (Mr. Shaw) would be bold to say, that there were not a body of men anywhere who were more anxious to promote the education of the people, and who exerted themselves more as far as their means extended. It was, no doubt, because the hon. Member was a sincere Catholic, that the hon. Member advocated the plan of Government, and it was because he was a Protestant that he opposed it. He believed that it would occasion the exclusion of the Bible.

Mr. *Wyse* said, all he wished was, that every man should guide himself by his own religion.

Mr. *Sheil* considered that the point at issue was reduced to this, whether there had been merely a substitution of extracts of the Scripture for the full perusal of it. When it was considered that the most unrestricted power of reading the Bible was provided upon two days in the week for the children who should be educated in the new schools, he did not understand how that point of objection could be seriously maintained.

Mr. *Strickland* said, on rising to move that the petition be printed, he would take that opportunity to deny the aspersions which had been thrown upon the petitioners, on the ground that the meeting, of which they formed a part, had been called for a purpose opposite to that to which their petition was directed. The fact of the matter was, that the public who had been at first excluded from the meeting alluded to, were subsequently admitted, in consequence of a general vote to that effect, and the result was the petition before the House.

Mr. *Robinson* said, he thought it would be impossible to get up any system of education which would please the two great parties in Ireland. He thought the best plan would be, when the grant was before the House, either to withhold the grant altogether, or divide it between both systems, according to their numbers or some other plan of division.

Petition to be printed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.] Mr. Stanley moved the Order of the Day for the House resolving itself into a Committee on the Tithes (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. *Robinson*, with reference to what had fallen from him on a former occasion respecting a motion of his which had dropped in consequence of there being no House on Thursday, complained that an officer connected with the Government should have come down and prevented a House being formed that day, although there was a sufficient number of Members within the walls to make a House. This, he had considered, could only have been done as a manœuvre either against his Motion, which he had repeatedly deferred to avoid interfering with the Reform Bill, or the Motions of two other hon. Members. He had expressed himself on a former occasion with some warmth, but he did not mean to persevere in the intention he then stated: but if such practice were resorted to hereafter, he should avail himself of every opportunity of showing his disgust and reprobation of it.

Lord *Althorp* assured the hon. Member that there had been no intention of evincing a want of courtesy towards him. The real state of the case was, that official business had pressed so much, and there being no question of urgent importance on that day, they had availed themselves of a custom which was by no means uncommon, without any intention of acting uncourteously to any Member.

ARREARS OF TITHES (IRELAND)] On the question that the Speaker leave the Chair,

Mr. *Ruthven* hoped, that, from the thin state of the House, his Majesty's Ministers would not urge their going into a Committee on the Bill then, but that further time should be afforded for consideration, and for additional information from Ireland.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* said, that he rose to urge upon the noble Lord, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite, one argument for delay, which had not as yet been put. It was this—this Bill was printed only on Thursday morning—it had been read a second time on Friday—the people in Dublin could not have had it until that morning—and Irish Members were called on to go into the Committee without having had the opportunity of knowing how the provisions of the Bill had been received in Ireland. It might be, that the feeling against the Bill would be mitigated when the actual provisions of it were known. For himself he would say, that one part of the Bill was, in his opinion, calculated to make them judge less harshly of the general measure; he alluded to the provisions with respect to costs—which, as they were to have such a Bill struck him as wise and salutary, and surely any delay that might accrue would be amply atoned for, if by such delay the Irish people could at all be reconciled to the measure. He put these matters plainly to the noble Lord. The delay until Thursday could not produce any evil consequence, and it would give time to hon. Members to hear from their constituents on this interesting subject.

Lord *Althorp* observed that it was not necessary to have a full House for the consideration of this Bill, as those more particularly interested in it were present, and would have a better opportunity of discussing it, clause by clause, in Committee. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Clare, he must say that, though the Bill was not known, the resolutions on which it was founded had been already so amply and frequently discussed, that he saw no reason whatever for delaying going into Committee.

Mr. *John Browne* complained that members for Ireland, who took part against this Bill, improperly arrogated to themselves the character of Representatives of Ireland. He thought the measure would tend to the future peace and prosperity of Ireland. He adopted the whole speech of the Solicitor General for Ireland. If the Government had not made this stand, they would be unworthy of the confidence of the country. He never would court that ephemeral popularity which was too much sought after by some of the Irish Representatives.

Lord *Killeen* said, he should not propose any further delay, nor should he suggest any amendment. He must, however, again protest against the Bill, which he felt confident would not be successful. He was not one of those alluded to by the hon. Member (Mr. Browne) who courted ephemeral popularity.

Mr. *Stanley* said, his hon. friend (Mr. Browne) could have meant no reflection on his noble friend. He alluded to those Gentlemen who were in the habit of claiming to be the sole Representatives of Ireland. In order to meet the objections of those who opposed the Bill, as much as possible, Ministers had determined to take off the restrictions as to the amount at which causes for the recovery of tithes might be brought into the Assistant Barrister's Court. He should move an Amendment in the Committee, allowing causes of any amount to be tried in the Court alluded to, and merely giving power to the Attorney General to carry the causes into the Court of Chancery, if he saw fit grounds for so doing.

The House then went into a Committee.

On the first Clause being read,

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* said, he was not one of those who courted ephemeral popularity, or arrogated to themselves the title of sole Representatives of Ireland. He pretended only to speak the sentiments of his own constituents, whom he knew to be hostile to the measure. He denied that he was, the advocate of a class or of a faction; he was on the contrary, the advocate of the Irish people; emphatically he would say the Irish people. He and those Members who acted with him had supported the Government in all the proper measures which they had proposed, and, that, too when English and Scotch Members did not find it convenient to attend to their duty in this House. The almost universal sense of Ireland was opposed to this Bill, and it was too much to coerce them without doing a necessary act of justice. The resistance to tithes was at present of a negative character, and this Bill would make it positive and only add another to the many evils which oppressed unhappy Ireland. Since this measure was brought forward the petitions against tithes had been more numerous than they were before, and he was sure that three parts of the most intelligent persons in Ireland were against the measure now proposed by his Majesty's Government. The evidence of a Mr. Walsh had been a good deal relied upon by the Government. It was said that Mr. Walsh was a Catholic; but he was sure that the noble member for Kilkenny would not say that Mr. Walsh was a gentleman whose Representations should be relied upon. But, to put that evidence aside, he would beg to ask why should the Government act the part of the tithe-proctors? No doubt it would relieve the parsons; but why relieve them at the expense of the public? The people of Ireland were aggrieved by the system of tithes, and it was the duty of Members in that House to sympathise with them. He and some other Irish Members had done so ineffectually; but that would not deter them from the fair discharge of their duty which they owed to their constituents. He was not the advocate of the seditious, nor of the Terry Alts; but he wished to do justice to the people of Ireland. It was said that a servile war had prevailed in that country, or at least in parts of it; and to what cause was that to be attributed? To the system of tithes, to oppressive rents, and to bad landlords. During the war the rents were well-paid, while tithes were resisted, and no human effort could now reconcile the people to their payment. The Government might sell their goods under this Bill, the gaols might be crowded with victims, but the result would be a still greater abhorrence to tithes. For himself he would say, that he was friendly to a repeal of the Union; and he was satisfied that this measure would materially tend to increase the number of those who supported that measure.

Mr. *Leader* said, that, having, in the previous discussions on this important question, declared the impossibility of his being induced to support any measure of coercion to enforce the payment of the arrears of the tithe in Ireland, without such a measure being accompanied with a remedial one calculated to tranquillize the agitated mind of the country, and to conciliate the affections of the people; and the House having resolved to go into Committee on the Bill for making the tithe payers of Ireland in arrear for the tithe of 1831 King's debtors, by combining the powers and revenues of the Church with those of the Crown against the people, he was bound to submit his judgment to that of the House, and to surrender his opposition to the principle of the Bill. However great, therefore, was his disapprobation of the measure, it became his duty to suggest and propose any measure which occurred to him, as likely to render it less expensive, and least oppressive to the country. And as, in the course of the debates, expressions galling to the feelings of Irishmen had at different times escaped in the course of these discussions, and observations unworthy and unjust had been occasionally thrown upon the opposers of this novel and dangerous measure, he must be excused for saying, that no aspersion uttered in that House or elsewhere could prevent Ireland from being considered other than a powerful and important country—greatly neglected, and too long subjected to misrule and misgovernment; and as the Members of Ireland who had opposed the coercive measures of the Government, had been taunted as not representing the Irish people, he would repel that statement by a single observation. The Irish Gentlemen who had opposed the measure—thirty-three Members for counties, cities, and populous towns—were greater in importance than all the Tory Members who had opposed Ministers in this and the last Parliament. If the question was left between those whom he must consider the friends of Ireland and their opponents, undoubtedly, the majority would be found on the side of the people; and if the question was to depend on the number of the

Irish Representatives who were opposed to the measure, and of those who supported the Government, the independents would be found superior to the regular opponents of the Government, and greater in their numbers than the Irish Members who had been the unvarying friends of the present Administration. Under those circumstances, he strenuously asserted, that no consideration but the feeling of paramount and imperious necessity and duty to their constituents could have induced thirty-three Irish Members, well disposed to give a reforming Ministry their most zealous support, to resist for the last five weeks this ill-judged and arbitrary measure. The aspersions on Ireland and the taunts on the conduct of the Irish Representatives had not had the effect of diverting his mind from a determined and constitutional resistance to this baneful expedient. He had been told by high authority in that House that a remedy for the existing grievances in Ireland would be prepared at the same time that any application was made for extraordinary powers—and as such powers were necessary to enforce the laws, proper remedies should be applied to remove all admitted grievances. He regretted to say, that he communicated with his constituents, and expressed his most sanguine expectation that they should speedily have to congratulate one another on the abolition of tithes, and that the payment of the arrear of 1831 would be of light and trivial moment when contrasted with the paramount importance of the extinction of this (as regards the Catholic occupiers of the soil) unjust and ruinous impost. He greatly lamented that he had not been able to realize the expectation which he held out not only to his constituents but to the members of public bodies who intrusted him with the presentation of their petitions. The clergy had been relieved, and the coercive measure, he might say, was now passed, and it was still open to him sincerely and ardently to hope that the remedial measure might now receive the same influential and decided support from his Majesty's Government, as the coercive measure had heretofore received. When, in the preamble of the Bill it was stated, that it was necessary to make special enactments, in order to vindicate the authority of the law, and to provide immediate relief for such of the clergy as were suffering from the deprivation of their incomes, by unlawful combination, he would beg to call the attention of the House to the nature of the old composition law which was sought to be vindicated, not by enforcing obedience to the law itself, but by a new-fangled legislation, uniting the Crown and the Church, and conferring extraordinary powers and resources against the people. By an Act passed in the fourth year of the reign of his late Majesty, George 4th, entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the composition for tithes in Ireland, for a limited time," sect. 38, it was thereby enacted, amongst other things, "That the amount of such composition and the several portions thereof, payable according to such assessments and applotments, and all arrears thereof, from time to time, not exceeding the amount of one whole year of such composition, shall be a charge on the land specified in such assessments and applotment, during the continuance of such composition, and shall be payable by the occupier or occupiers of such lands, or by the owner of such lands, occupying the same for the time being, according to the quantity of such land, which each occupier shall from time to time, hold and occupy; and that it shall be lawful for the incumbent, and for every and any other person, or persons, or body politic, or corporation, or corporate collegiate or corporation, entitled to such composition, or any part, share, or portion thereof, or to cause the same to be levied upon the several lands specified in such assessment, or applotment, and on the several occupiers of such lands for the time being, in preference to any other charge upon such lands by all the ways and means allowed by law for the recovery of rent; and it shall and may be lawful for any collector, or person appointed to collect and levy the amount of such composition, from time to time, as the same shall become due, and every such collector so appointed shall collect and levy, and is hereby authorized, empowered, and required to collect and levy all and every sum and sums of money which shall become due from time to time in respect of such corporation to the incumbent or other person or body politic, or corporate, or collegiate, or corporation, in whose behalf such collector shall be appointed to levy the same."—Such being the power under the Composition Act, and it being admitted in evidence that the amount of tithe bore a small proportion to the amount of property of the tithe-payer, and it being also put beyond all doubt by the parliamentary official returns, that an immense force of police and army were spread over the surface of the districts in which the arrear of 1831 was due, and that three-fourths of the debt to the clergy consisted of arrears of composition rent, he would ask on what ground did the right hon. the Secretary for Ireland contend for new and extraordinary powers? Would he contend that if the Crown was assignee of the composition rent and the tithe, and possessed ample power under the existing law to distrain for composition rent, and levy the amount of decrees for tithes granted at Quarter Sessions, and along with those powers, there was a certainty of finding abundant effects, and an overwhelming force of civil and military on the spot, in the name of Heaven, what more did the right hon. Gentleman require to recover this 60,000*l.* advanced to the clergy? Were not the existing laws, the existing means of the tithe-payers, and the existing civil and military force of the country, sufficient to vindicate the law, if the vindication of the law was the great object of his care, his vigilance, and his solicitude? He would ask the right hon. Gentleman, if he had these powers, why should he require greater? With these ample and undoubted powers, why was it that he had brought in this Act to make the King's subjects the King's debtors, and when thus accountable to the Crown, make not only their lands on which the tithe grew, but all their lands liable to the demand of the Crown; and, as he would assert, under the authority of Hughes's case, in Gilbert's Exchequer, 126, as King's debtor, also make them liable to execution, so that they could not be bailed? Would the Solicitor General deny, that by the Common-law, execution might be issued, not only against the goods and chattels, but the lands of the King's debtor; could he deny that by 21st and 22nd Edward 3rd, c. 20, in the Irish Statutes, "all obligations to the King shall have the force of a Statute staple—the King shall be preferred in suit and execution; all lands which any persons accountable to the King have, whilst so accountable, are liable to the King's debt, and the Court of Exchequer, may order the estate of King's debtors to be sold by summary process." Against this, under these circumstances, coercive law, founded on the worst principles of legislation, he entered his solemn protest. For such an Act of Parliament he never was prepared, on bringing up the Report of the Tithe Committee. There was no precedent for such a law in the worst times of British or even Irish legislation, and a bad precedent for Ireland was not without its danger to Great Britain. For his part, as he could not offer further resistance to the Bill, he would move in the third clause, "that all remedies now existing for the recovery of such tithe, or composition for tithes respectively, shall rest in his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and such tithe and composition for tithes, shall be recovered and enforced by the proceedings, and in the manner heretofore used for the recovery of such tithes, or composition for tithes respectively, and not otherwise;" and also after the fourth clause, he would move a provision that nothing contained in the Act should render the person or persons making such default as aforesaid, liable as accountant or debtor to the Crown, further than he or they would be in case this Act had not passed, and that all proceedings taken under this Act should be taken in the name of the ecclesiastical person obtaining relief, by virtue of the provisions hereinbefore contained; and then he should move that the remainder of this Act, with all its new and dangerous, crude and ill-digested machinery, should be entirely omitted—being bound by the Resolutions of the House not to oppose further the grant or loan of 60,000*l.* to the clergy, and being bound by the further Resolution of the House to give the Crown the means of recovery, he had endeavoured, without further encroachments on the best principles of the Constitution, to suggest the remedy which in his mind would be amply adequate to the existing emergency. When the people of Ireland found that Parliament was pledged to the extinction of tithes, and the Crown had become the assignee only of the existing arrears, he entertained the hope that without the enactment of new and odious powers, the existing laws would be found sufficient to enforce the payment of what was fairly due to the clergy. Did the right hon. Gentleman imagine that the landlords of Ireland had not an equal interest as the occupiers of the soil, in these novel, dangerous, and expensive proceedings? Were journeys of tenants, with their witnesses, to attend the Master's office—of the Chancery and Exchequer expenses, undeserving of the smallest consideration? Were defences to the proceedings of his Majesty's Attorney General so trifling and inconsiderable as to be matters too insignificant to arrest the attention of an Administration, whose sole care and time was unfortunately occupied in subjects of more interest to themselves, and of more importance to the country? He would ask the right hon. Secretary, was not the produce of the Irish soil subjected already to abundant encumbrance, without placing the suitor's agent in Chancery, for he must be first paid, as an encumbrance before the Crown, the Church, or the landlord? Could the tithe-payers be defended without a heavy advance for the expenses of witnesses obliged to take long journeys, and solicitors who would not be disposed to give much credit, or make advances for Crown debtors? In that entire measure, the interest of the landlord was indissolubly linked with the interest of the tithe payer. Would any one deny, that tithes, and law costs, and costs of witnesses, and Equity Courts, must all come out of the produce of the land? Were there manufactories, or was there a prosperous foreign commerce in Ireland to supply the deficiency? Under these circumstances, would any one say, that when the land must bear the burthen those who depend on the proceeds of the land, must not be prepared to submit to privation and loss? He knew the answer, which was prepared and ready, to his earnest solicitude to adhere to the existing laws of the country it was "no sales can be effected if made under distress, and it was necessary that proper examples should be made of determined and incorrigible combinators;" to this answer he would reply, the people would probably never pay the clergy, and certainly with the greatest discontent would never pay the Crown—but still his belief, founded on a knowledge of the people, and the landlords of Ireland, that property probably to the value of 600,000*l.*, would never be permitted to be destroyed; the lands would not be denuded of cattle, and the industry of the country suspended, for the purpose of resisting this demand, particularly when there was not only a great probability, but a certainty, of the extinction of tithe. For once he placed the greatest confidence in the justice, temper, and generous reliance, on the good sense of the country. If haughty, insulting, and irritating measures, were unwise and reprehensible against individuals, much more indefensible were they when directed against an excited and populous community. He considered it to be his good fortune to have lived in uninterrupted affection with those Irishmen who were amongst the greatest ornaments of that House; who, in times of public commotion, and of impending foreign invasion, resisted the Arms Bill for Ireland as oppressive and tyrannical, and who permitted the Insurrection Act to continue a dead letter on the Statute-book, when Magistrates from various parts of Ireland required it to quell dangerous disturbances in most critical and dangerous times. On these occasions, their hopes of tranquillity were not in flying to new laws, but in endeavouring to vindicate the old ones. Would any one tell him that if the arrear of tithe for 1831, instead of being confined to a small district, as he knew it was, were general over Ireland, that the landed interest, from the highest to the lowest, would not be reduced by this Bill to a state which it was painful to contemplate, and on which he could not trust himself to dilate? He thought it not improbable that men of condition and resolution might be sent to gaol as debtors of the Crown, and might come out of it as Representatives of the people. He was no friend to laws which converted good subjects into Crown debtors, and if rewards were to be conferred, he would prefer seeing them reserved for persons whose lives were devoted peaceably to the interests of their country, rather than to those who by resistance to improvident laws had won the esteem and ensured the confidence of the people. He had no amendments to propose but those he had suggested, and as a remedial measure for the abolition of tithes had not preceded this coercive measure, he would conclude, by expressing his deep regret, that it had been introduced at a moment when the attention of Parliament was so exclusively devoted to other subjects of such great importance, as almost to preclude the possibility of all the great constitutional principles involved in this important question being adequately considered and discussed.

Mr. *Crampton* had already troubled the House too often on this Bill; he would, therefore, only observe, in answer to what had been said by the hon. Member, that the Bill contained no provision for arrest, save in execution, and that the prerogative rights of the Crown had been ceded in the Bill; neither could the costs of proceeding fall on the landlord or tenant, but on the clergyman, and as to the Attorney or Solicitor General, he could say, that they would derive no increase of emolument under this Bill.

Clause agreed to.

Several other Clauses were also, after a few verbal Amendments, agreed to.

On the clause providing for the issuing of proclamations calling for the payment of the arrears of tithe, and notifying, in case of default, that proceedings would be taken on the part of the Crown within one month from the date of the insertion of such proclamation in *The Dublin Gazette*, being put,

Mr. *Ruthven* objected to the clause; as *The Dublin Gazette* was a publication never seen in many parts of the country, and quite unknown in others. Such a proclamation as that proposed would afford no notice at all to the people. He should not divide the House, but could not avoid expressing his objection to this clause.

Mr. *Stanley* said, the object of the clause was merely to afford legal evidence of the issuing of the proclamation, and that care would be taken by the Government to distribute copies of the proclamation through the country.

Mr. *Sheil* suggested that the proclamation should be inserted in the newspapers published in the several counties where it was sought to enforce the provisions of this Bill. On consideration, perhaps, the expense of such a publication might be considered too great, and all he would ask was, that copies of the proclamation should be extensively circulated and posted through the several districts. He should, therefore, suggest the propriety of making an addition to the clause to that effect.

Mr. *Crampton* could not hesitate to acquiesce in the suggestion of the hon. and learned member for Louth, inasmuch as all the Government sought by the clause was, to give ample and sufficient notice to all parties concerned of the intentions of the Government.

The clause, as amended, agreed to.

Several other clauses were then agreed to.

On the clause exempting all proceedings under the Act for Stamp duties and office fees being read,

Mr. *Crampton* moved, as an amendment—"That no costs should be due or payable under this Bill, except as before provided for."

Mr. *Lefroy* objected to this amendment, as he thought it most unjust to mulct the clergy, and protect those defendants who had voluntarily become defaulters. This was nothing short of holding out a premium to combination.

The Committee divided on the Amendment: Ayes 107; Noes 13—Majority 94.

List of the NOES.

Clerk, Sir G.
Cole, Lord
Fitzgerald, Sir A.
Hayes, Sir E.
Holmes, W.
Jones, T.
Lefroy, T.
Lefroy, A.
Maxwell, H.
Shaw, F.
Somerset, Lord G.
Vyvyan, Sir R.
Young, J.

The remaining clauses agreed to.

On the preamble being read,

Mr. *Ruthven* moved, that all the words after "whereas," be omitted, for the purpose of inserting these words—"A general disposition against the payment of tithes has existed in many parts of Ireland, and the ordinary course usually practised in the payment thereof has been relinquished, so that numbers of the clergy are reduced to a state of great distress, and it has become necessary and expedient to provide immediate means for their relief." He moved this Amendment in consistency with his previous opposition to other parts of the Bill, but he would not trouble the Committee to divide upon it. His complaint was, that the people of Ireland were charged with an illegal combination against the payment of tithes, whereas the reason for the non-payment was, a stimultaneous feeling against it, which operated in the same manner upon all persons.

The question having been put,

Mr. *Crampton* said, if there was one fact on which the whole of the Committee, and of the witnesses were agreed, without a shade of difference, it was, as to the existence of an organized opposition to the payment of tithes.

The Amendment negatived. House resumed.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND) BILL.] On the Motion that this Bill be read a second time,

Mr. *Lefroy* moved, as an amendment,

that this Bill should be recommitted. The ground on which he made the motion was, that the Bill would work injustice to an individual. It had been proposed to grant a salary of 1,500*l.* a-year to the Registrar, but, by an amendment, the salary had been reduced to 1,200*l.* As this was a question in which vested rights were concerned, he trusted he should receive the attention of the House to the circumstances he was about to detail. By the Act of 9 George 4th, the Lords of the Treasury were empowered, on the decease of the then Registrar, to appoint another, and fix his salary. The late Registrar died in May, 1830, and Mr. Moore, who had acted for thirty-one years as his deputy, in the course of the month of July following received a letter from the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goulburn), offering him the situation at a salary of 1,500*l.* a year. This Mr. Moore immediately accepted. From this simple statement of facts he was prepared to contend, that Mr. Moore had a fair claim to the salary offered him. He would, however, go further, and show that, on the 27th of July in the same year, a Treasury minute was made, fixing his salary at 1,500*l.* a year. This minute was immediately acted upon, it was communicated to Mr. Moore, and, at the same time, he received a letter from Mr. Stewart—a gentleman who held a situation in the Treasury—desiring him forthwith to furnish an account of the receipts and disbursements of the office, up to the day of the date of the minute, upon which day he was to be considered as entering into the new engagement. Mr. Moore, of course, complied with this order, he also received, at the same time, a letter from another department of the Treasury, requiring him to remit 118*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.* to that office, as the amount of, and to pay for, the stamp on his appointment, the expense of which would have been less, had the salary been but one pound less than 1,500*l.* a-year. The officer who called on Mr. Moore for this remittance stated to him that his appointment was made out, and would be completed on the receipt of the money. Mr. Moore accordingly remitted the sum required. His appointment was executed by the noble Duke at the head of the Government, and two other Lords of the Treasury, and was forwarded to him by return of post. He appealed to the House, whether it was possible to state a case of a more plain, vested, legal title under the Act than that which he had referred to, and which the documents he possessed fully sustained? Under that Act, the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury had authority to regulate the office, to appoint the officer, and fix the salary. On the 27th of July, 1830, they did appoint Mr. Moore, and fixed the salary. The Chancellor of the Exchequer communicated the appointment to Mr. Moore, and that gentleman accepted the office, and provided the necessary stamp. He had, as Deputy Registrar, rendered all his accounts up to the moment of his new appointment, and that appointment took place with all due and legal solemnity. Besides, the House must bear in mind this additional fact: Mr. Moore was entitled, under the Act, to have retired from office, and to have called upon the Lords of the Treasury to give him compensation, if they did not think him fit to be retained; but, of course, when they proposed to appoint him as Principal Registrar, he abandoned all claim to compensation. Mr. Moore had been thirty-one years discharging the duties of the office as Deputy Registrar, to the entire satisfaction of the public. It could not be considered as a matter of favour, or bear the character of a job, to continue Mr. Moore as Principal Registrar. He, therefore, trusted that, under these circumstances, the House would not entertain a doubt as to the justice of his claim to the continuance of the salary of 1,500*l.* a-year. Indeed, such was the view taken of it by the hon. Gentleman who framed this Bill, and the salary was accordingly fixed in that Bill at 1,500*l.* a-year. That hon. Gentleman raised no question as to Mr. Moore's right; on the contrary, he stated to the House that, if it were a new question as to the salary Mr. Moore was to receive, he thought the duties of the office would entitle him to 1,500*l.* a-year. The Secretary of the Treasury also founded the claim to the 1,500*l.* salary upon the ground of the additional duties and increased responsibility which would be attached to the office by the Bill. The Solicitor General for Ireland concurred fully in recommending to the House the amount of salary as specified in it. In truth, Mr. Moore's friends had no reason to anticipate any resistance on the subject: consequently, they came entirely unprepared with the documents which he was now able to lay before the House, to support Mr. Moore's claim to the higher salary; and by whom was the salary, as specified by the Bill, opposed? Not by Government, but by the hon. and learned member for Louth (Mr. Sheil), who was an entire stranger to the whole transaction. As there was no hon. Member prepared with the documents to establish Mr. Moore's title to the 1,500*l.* a year, the question was discussed upon the ground of the adequacy of the salary to the duties of the office; and it appearing to some Gentlemen that 1,500*l.* was more than sufficient, the House, by a majority of two carried the amendment that fixed it at 1,200*l.* It was for the purpose of giving the House an opportunity to reconsider the question that he now proposed to move that the Bill be recommitted, when he would lay the documents before them that would completely establish Mr. Moore's right to the salary he now claimed; and that, therefore, the amount should be restored in the Bill to what it stood at originally. He begged to move that this Bill be recommitted.

Mr. *Hume* wished to ask the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether, in arranging this salary, he was acting on the principle laid down by the Committee which reported on the salaries to be paid to public officers. The noble Lord had, on that occasion, stated, that it would be necessary for Government to consider the duties to be performed, and the responsibility the office imposed, and that salaries should be regulated accordingly. It was on that principle the Committee prepared the plan recommended by them, and upon which he understood Government had pledged themselves to act. He had heard that this was an office which admitted of the absence of the persons holding it for weeks together, and that the actual duties to be performed were of very little importance, compared to those of an officer in his Majesty's Treasury, whose salary had been reduced, in pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee. He wished to hear from the noble Lord, whether he was satisfied on that point, before this Bill went into Committee? If any question was likely to arise, the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee upstairs, in order that the duties of the office might be ascertained. He understood that the situation did not interfere with this officer acting in the way of his profession in the Courts of Law. If, then, the House was really anxious to reduce the public expenditure, let a Special Committee ascertain the duties of this office, and by a fair appreciation, either reduce or increase the salary as the nature of the case required.

Lord *Althorp* said, his honourable friend had asked him a question, to which, undoubtedly, he should be compelled to answer, that if this matter were to be looked at in an abstract manner, he should not give his vote in the way he felt it his duty to give it on the present occasion. If he was asked whether 1,200*l.* a-year was not a sufficient salary for the duties proposed to be discharged by the Registrar in Ireland, he should certainly say it was. But the question which the House had now to consider was a very different one; because Mr. Moore was appointed to this office during his good behaviour, and which office imposed on him the discharge of some very trifling duties; and he was permitted to hold a seat in Parliament; whereas, the duties imposed by the present Bill would compel him to constantly attend his duties in Dublin, and deprive him of the power to sit in Parliament. These were the circumstances which made him come to the decision, that the addition of 300*l.* to the present salary, was a fair remuneration for the additional duties thrown upon an officer holding a place during good behaviour, especially when those additional duties would be advantageous to the public service. Another part of the case which had been stated by the honourable and learned Gentleman (Mr. Lefroy) was of a different nature. He had argued, that, even if additional duties had not been thrown upon Mr. Moore, still he had a right to the additional 300*l.* He was not quite so certain of that point. It was true, it was stated to Mr. Moore, at the time he was appointed, that the salary would be 1,500*l.* a-year; and, on the 27th of July, 1830, a Treasury Minute was made, giving him that amount of salary. But when the present Government came into office, they found another Treasury Minute, dated the same day, stating that the salary should be 1,200*l.* and not 1,500*l.* Upon inquiry, however, he found that this other minute was not actually written on the 27th of July, but some months afterwards, although bearing that date. The House was to consider that Mr. Moore accepted of his situation, believing at the time, that he was to receive 1,500*l.* a-year. Additional duties were to be thrown upon the office, and the proposition was, to raise the salary to the amount which Mr. Moore expected when he was appointed. Under all these circumstances, without being able, which he certainly was not, to state that 1,200*l.* was not a sufficient salary, he certainly should give his vote for the recommittal of the Bill, that the House might reconsider the decision they came to on a former occasion. He spoke individually, a question having been especially addressed to him on the subject.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, the documents referred to by his hon. and learned friend, the member for the University of Dublin, virtually acknowledged the appointment of Mr. Moore at the higher salary; and, as he considered that this House was exercising its functions judicially, he knew no other course that could be taken, than to go into Committee, and correct, if necessary, an erroneous act of the Government.

Mr. *Sheil* said, on looking at this Bill, he was convinced that it imposed no substantial responsibility, nor any augmentation of duties; but, on the contrary, there were some exceedingly important accommodations afforded to the Registrar, which he did not enjoy before. He found there were two Assistant-Registrars allowed, instead of one, as fixed by the minutes which had hitherto regulated the office; and also such a number of clerks as the Registrar should, from time to time, appoint. Under these circumstances, he wished to ascertain what were the additional duties as well as what increased responsibility there was imposed? He contended, that nothing had been stated by the mover of the Amendment to warrant the House in acceding to the Motion. The duties of the Registrar did not occupy his mind; they merely demanded manual labour; and Mr. Moore was not upon any grounds entitled to the increase of salary the friends of that gentleman demanded. He was of opinion, upon other grounds, that the increase should be denied. Mr. Moore was not prevented by the office of Registrar, from attending to his professional duties. Mr. Moore was a barrister of extensive practice, and, in the Ecclesiastical Court alone he made 1,200*l.* a-year. He must, therefore, call on the House to abide by its former decision, and not to be unravelling what it had already done. He insisted that no new arguments had been brought forward, and that a clear and palpable case should be made out before the House should give its assent to the Amendment.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that, with reference to the two Treasury Minutes connected with the appointment, he must explain that the first one, mentioning the larger sum, had been forwarded to Mr. Moore by mistake. It had never, however, passed the Board, although it was laid before them, but some of the subordinate departments, whose duty it was to act upon it, had taken it for granted that, as it was proposed, it would pass, and they had written to apprize Mr. Moore of the matter. Though he did not stand there to justify such mistakes, yet he trusted that they would readily admit that it could easily occur in the hurry of business. Allowing that the unauthenticated minute had been so far acted upon, it would be a most dangerous doctrine to conclude, that the public were to be bound by a mistake. Moreover, he did not consider Mr. Moore had any right to complain, for he had been receiving the salary of 1,200*l.*, and, if he had thought himself entitled to more, he was bound to make his demand, and to complain of the injury done to him. In answer to what some hon. Members had said on the question of labour, he must beg leave to state, that formerly Mr. Moore could obtain thirty days' leave of absence from time to time, but that, under the present Bill, his attendance to the duties of his office would be constantly required, without any kind of intermission; and, as to responsibility, he (Mr. Moore) would be also responsible for all the business of his office, and for the acts of all the persons employed in it.

Mr. *Shaw* was somewhat surprised that any gentleman in independent circumstances, would accept such a serious responsibility as was cast upon Mr. Moore for the salary he received, even allowing that to be 1,500*l.* a-year. But, as he had done so on the faith of receiving that remuneration for his services, he had a strict legal right to be paid that amount. The case was simply this—in July, 1830, Mr. Moore became entitled, under the Act 9, George 4th, to a compensation for thirty-one years service; in lieu of this he accepted a situation which was tendered to him with a salary, authorised by a Treasury Minute, which was inclosed to him. The right hon. Gentleman who spoke last said, that Mr. Moore had acquiesced in receiving the reduced amount of salary, but he had no remedy. He received his appointment in July, and without any suspicion that a reduction was contemplated. In November a change in the Ministry took place, and immediately afterwards the Bill before them had been brought in by the hon. member for Mallow, who, without any concert with Mr. Moore, fixed his salary at the same amount as the Treasury Minute. Mr. Moore and his friends, therefore, thought it was unnecessary to bring the subject before Parliament. As to receiving 1,200*l.* a-year, he had certainly done so, but he had always taken the money under a protest.

Mr. *Lamb*, having voted on a former occasion against this increase of salary, had only to say his opinion remained unchanged. The office had been a sinecure over paid; and now it was made an efficient situation, with a proper salary. In the midst of retrenchment which had taken place, he could not see why they were to go out of the way to give this 300*l.* a-year to an office which certainly any person ought to discharge for half the compensation given in the Bill. He did, however, think they had some right to expect an explanation from the late Ministry respecting the two minutes. But be that as it might they ought to pair off together, for the House ought to deal with the question entirely upon its own merits.

Lord *Granv. Somerset* said, as allusions had been made to him by the right hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House, and by the hon. member for Louth, he would state that it was the intention of his Majesty's Government when the Treasury Minute was made, that the officer should be compensated in a way to insure the regular performance of the duties. The amount of salary had accordingly been fixed after a full consideration of the duties thrown on the Registrar. Since that period other duties had been added, and, therefore, the salary might not now be adequate. He should vote on the occasion with the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretary of the Treasury. In doing so he proved that he had more confidence in the Government than the under Secretary for the Home Department.

Mr. *Crampton* said, the simple question was, on which Minute was Mr. Moore appointed. He believed that the first one, fixing the largest amount of salary, was the one said never to have been regularly passed, but undoubtedly it had been acted on, and if so, the Treasury had no power to repeal it, and reappoint with a smaller salary. No such power was given them by the Act under which the first appointment was granted, he should, therefore, vote for the re-committal of the Bill.

Mr. *Jephson* said, he had already delivered an opinion that Mr. Moore's duties and responsibilities having been increased by the present measure, he was entitled to the addition proposed; and though the present discussion had not originated with him, he felt himself called upon to support the Amendment of the hon. and learned member for the University of Dublin. There were two points mentioned in the discussion, which he wished to explain. The first was, that two deputy Registrars were appointed by the Bill; he had done this at the recommendation of the profession in Dublin. The next was, what was the remedy against the Registrar in case of misconduct; why, the aggrieved party could summon him before a Judge, who was enabled to proceed summarily against him, and fine him to the extent of 100*l.* if the case demanded it.

The House divided on the Amendment: Ayes 69; Noes 62—majority 7.

List of the Noes.

ENGLAND.

Baring, F. T.
Benett, J.
Bentinck, Lord G.
Bernal, R.
Blamire, W.
Bouverie, Hon. P. P.
Bulwer, E. L.
Burke Sir John.
Calvert, C.
Carter, J. B.
Chaytor, W. R. C.
Chichester, J. P. B.
Curteis, H. B.
Denman, Sir T.
Dundas, Hon. T.
Ellice, E.
Evans, W.
Fox, Lieut.-Colonel
Gisborne, T.
Hudson, T.
Ingilby, Sir W. A.
King, E. B.
Knight, R.
Macdonald, Sir J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Palmer, C. F.
Poyntz, W. S.
Rickford, W.
Robinson, Sir G.
Rooper, J. B.
Scott, Sir E. D.
Sebright, Sir J.
Spencer, Hon. Capt.
Stanley, J.
Strickland, G.
Strutt, E.
Stuart, Lord D.
Thicknesse, R.
Thomson, Rt.Hn.C.P.
Throckmorton, R. G.
Tomes, J.
Tracey, C. H.
Venables, Alderman
Vernon, Hon. G. J.
Villiers, T. H.
Warburton, H.
Webb, Colonel E.
Wilks, J.
Williams, W. A.

SCOTLAND.
Dixon, J.
Johnstone, J.
IRELAND.
Callaghan, D.
Doyle, Sir J. M.
Duncannon, Viscount
French, A.
Grattan, J.
Lamb, Hon. G.
Lambert, J. S.
Macnamara, W.
O'Connell, M.
Ruthven, E. S.
White, Colonel H.
Wyse, T.
TELLERS
Hume, J.
Sheil, R. L.

Mr. *Hume* said, that from what had already transpired on the subject at present before the House, he did not hesitate to think that inquiry into the nature and duties of the office held by Mr. Moore was called for, and it ought to be investigated whether or not those duties were not of such a character as that 500*l.* per annum would be ample remuneration. He should, therefore, move, that that bill be re-committed for such inquiry to a Select Committee.

Mr. *Jephson* was anxious that the fullest inquiry should be had on the subject, and fully acquiesced in the proposition of the hon. member for Middlesex.

Mr. *John Campbell* thought the remuneration of Mr. Moore was quite inadequate to the responsibilities of the office, which, unlike that in Yorkshire, with a salary of 2,000*l.* per annum, was not a sinecure.

The House again divided on the question "that the Bill be re-committed to a Select Committee." Ayes 91; Noes 25: —Majority 66.

Appointment of Committee, on the Motion of Mr. Hume, adjourned till a future day.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, April 10, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the LORD CHANCELLOR, from the Gentry, Yeomanry, and others of Thorney, in the Isle of Ely; Noblemen, Gentlemen, Freeholders, Justices of the Peace, Commissioners of Supply, Heritors, and others of the County of Roxburgh; Heritors and Householders of Cromarty, Inhabitants of Wells, Great Driffield, Mansfield, Neelston, Lockwennock, and Wigton. By the Earl of CAMPERDOWN, from the Inhabitants of Kelsyth, Colessie, and Balmerino. By the Earl of ALBEMARLE, from the Inhabitants of Misterton; and by the Marquis of DOWNSHIRE, from the Inhabitants of Drumgath, in favour of Reform:—By the Duke of RUTLAND, from the Mayor and Corporation of Leicester, calling on the House, before they passed any Reform Bill, to give it a calm and dispassionate consideration; and from the Inhabitants of Kentford, Denham, Dalham, Ashley, Gazelly, and Leicester; and by the Earl of KINNOUL, from the Presbytery of Dunblane and Auchterarder, against the New Plan of Education in Ireland:—By the Earl of RADNOR, from the Operative Cotton Spinners of Carlisle, in favour of the Bill for Limiting the Hours of Labour in Factories.

BOROUGH OF ARUNDEL.] Lord *Wynford* presented a Petition from the Members of the Corporation of Arundel, to which he was anxious to call the attention of their Lordships. Their Lordships were aware that Commissioners had been appointed to regulate the limits of boroughs in certain cases. The petitioners complained of the arrangement of those Commissioners by which the town of Little Hampton was included in, and was henceforth to form a part of, the borough of Arundel, so that the inhabitants of the former were to have equal right of voting with those of the latter; and the ground on which they rested their objection was, that the greater part of Little Hampton being the property of a Peer of the realm, the voters from it would turn the whole district into a close borough. He (Lord Wynford) was no enemy to what were called close boroughs, but he would say, that if they were abolished on the one side, they ought to be so equally on the other. The petitioners stated, that there were twenty places much nearer to Arundel than Little Hampton, and, from situation and other causes, equally entitled to share in its franchise; but all these the Commissioners had passed over, and gone four miles out of their way to include that place. In these places the noble Duke in question had no property, but nearly the whole of the town and neighbourhood of Little Hampton was his; so that he would have an overwhelming influence, if that town were included in the borough. So strongly did he (Lord Wynford) feel the impropriety of this decision of the Commissioners — so much was he impressed with the facts stated in the petition, and other facts which had come to his knowledge on this subject—that he now gave notice, that if the Reform Bill should be read a second time, he would on Tuesday next move, that before it proceeded any further, the Reports of those Commissioners be referred to a Committee, with power to examine as to the grounds of their decision, in order that equal justice might be done to boroughs in the south as well as in the north; and to see that no unfair distinction was made between Whig and Tory influence.

The Duke of *Richmond* said, that, when the Bill should be in Committee, he thought he should be able to satisfy the noble and learned Lord, that the decision of the Commissioners in uniting Little Hampton with Arundel would not have the effect which he anticipated. In the noble and learned Lord's anxiety to prevent what he seemed to fear would be the overwhelming influence of a Peer in Parliament in the borough as it was proposed to be in future constituted, he had wholly overlooked the sort of influence exercised in the borough by those very parties from whom the petition came. This petition was from the Corporation, who were no doubt extremely unwilling to lose the power and influence which they now possessed in the return of the Members for the borough. The persons who got up the petition were seven resident gentlemen belonging to the Corporation, who felt that, if this Bill should pass, the influence which they now possessed would be shared amongst the inhabitants of Little Hampton and Arundel generally. They were, therefore, very naturally opposed to any extension of the franchise either to Little Hampton or to any other place. For his own part, if it could be made apparent that any arrangement as to the franchise would have the effect of making the place a close borough, he would oppose it. He pledged himself, and he was sure his noble colleagues would give him credit for the statement, that he would not be satisfied to have one close borough left. He would, therefore, not stop short at the number of fifty-six in schedule A, but would go on to sixty or sixty-three, if that number of close boroughs should be shown to exist. He could by no means believe that the objection to the extension of the franchise to Little Hampton was well founded. That place was the port of Arundel. The whole trade of the latter place was carried on through it, and it was, therefore, very natural that the Commissioners should make a selection of a place so intimately connected with the borough, to be included in the extension of its franchise. But it was said, that the town of Little Hampton was the property of a noble Duke (the Duke of Norfolk). It was not exclusively his property. It was true, that the noble Duke was owner of many of the houses there, but they were let on long building leases, so that the noble Duke could not possess that influence which the noble and learned Lord seemed to apprehend. However, when they should come to the question as to that borough in the Committee, if the noble and learned Lord should make out a case against the borough as one which would still be under undue influence, and would move that it be transferred to schedule A, he would pledge himself to second the motion.

Lord *Wynford* said, he was not sufficiently acquainted with the place to know whether the noble Duke was correct or not in his statement as to the influence of those whom he described as the resident electors; but he thought that all who knew the borough of Arundel were aware that the influence in the return of its Members did not belong to the Corporation, but to a very different party. The noble Duke had not, in his opinion, given anything like a satisfactory answer to the objection —that the town of Little Hampton, which was distant four miles from Arundel, should be selected as a proper place for the extension of the franchise of the borough, while twenty places of equal importance, which were much nearer, were overlooked. The noble Duke had said, that the land belonging to the Duke of Norfolk was let out on building leases. It was a fact, that leases of seventy years were given, but it was also a fact that the noble Duke in question was also the owner of much uncovered ground there, by building on which he might so extend his influence as to overwhelm all the other voters. But he would ask, when the noble Duke talked of long building leases having been granted, whether it was not a fact that there was a clause in each of those leases by which the transfer of them was prohibited, unless with the consent of the noble owner of the soil? If that were the case, could it be denied for a moment that the noble Duke would, by this extension of the franchise to Little Hampton, become possessed of such an overwhelming influence as would give him entire dominion over the return for the borough? He owned he was not convinced of the fitness of the extension of the franchise to this port by what had fallen from the noble Duke. Little Hampton, it seemed, was the port of Arundel, and the site of its Custom-house; but what necessary connexion was there between the owners of ships and the franchise? Others, who resided nearer to Arundel, were as much entitled to the franchise as the ship-owners of the port of Little Hampton; and, as to the Custom-house, he saw no claim on that ground, for no Custom-house officer could vote at all. On the whole, he must say, he had heard nothing from the noble Duke which at all altered his opinion. He had waited with impatience to hear some explanation on the subject from the noble Duke, but he had heard nothing which satisfied him.

The Duke of *Richmond* said, he would not follow the noble and learned Lord into this rather irregular conversation, but would content himself with repeating, that, if the noble and learned Lord should be of opinion that the borough would be under undue influence, let him move that it be placed in schedule A, and he would support the motion.

Lord *Wynford* would not adopt the suggestion of the noble Duke, by moving that the borough be placed in schedule A. He thought the only fair and impartial course would be to draw a circle round the borough, and let all places within that circle be equally included. This would be a much more impartial course than that of selecting a town four miles off, and leaving the intermediate places excluded.

The Earl of *Falmouth* said, that he had hitherto remained silent on this subject, but he could not refrain from offering a few words, to express his astonishment at the great change which the opinions of the noble Duke had undergone within a short time on this important question of Reform. He remembered well, that when, in the year 1829, a noble Earl (the Earl of Winchilsea), indignant at the decision of Parliament with respect to the Catholic Question, had declared himself a Reformer, the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond), who agreed with the noble Earl on the subject of the Catholic Question, took care not to have it inferred, that, because he concurred with the noble Earl in the one point, he also agreed with him in the other, and he distinctly disclaimed being considered as a Reformer. Then came the companion of the Catholic Relief Bill—the bill for disfranchising the 40*s.* freeholders in Ireland—and he well remembered the earnestness with which the noble Duke denounced that measure. He also remembered the protest which the noble Duke had aftewards placed on the Journals, and that it was, if possible, still stronger in its denunciation of the principle of the disfranchising bill than the opinions he expressed in his speech on that occasion. He would not now do more than invite the attention of their Lordships to the speech and the protest of the noble Duke on that occasion, and to contrast them with the new-born zeal which he now evinced on the question of Reform. He did not mean to deny the sincerity of the opinions which the noble Duke now avowed, but, having noticed that important change which had taken place in them within so short a time, he could not refrain from inviting the attention of their Lordships to the great contrast between the noble Duke's opinions as to disfranchisement then and at the present time.

The Duke of *Richmond* regretted that the noble Earl had not deferred these remarks on his conduct, until a time, when, according to the forms of the House, he could rise to defend himself. After having already risen twice on the same question, he could not now, without the indulgence of their Lordships, proceed to make those observations which the remarks of the noble Earl called for. If, however, their Lordships gave him permission, he would address himself to what he must consider a most unjustifiable attack upon him. The noble Earl had charged him with having changed his opinion on the question of Reform. If he were only now a Reformer never having been so before, he might use the language which many of their Lordships had addressed to the House, and defend himself by stating that the times had changed, and that that which might not have been necessary some time ago was now become essential. If he looked to the speeches of those who were never before Reformers, but who now wished to be thought so to some extent, he should find it admitted by the great majority that the time was now arrived when some general measure of Reform was necessary. As to the circumstances that took place at the period to which the noble Earl (the Earl of Falmouth) had alluded, he begged leave to remind their Lordships that a nobleEarl (the Earl of Winchilsea) had declared that the Catholic Bill having been passed, he considered a Reform of Parliament necessary. The noble Earl said, that he would even go further, and if a motion were made that the right rev. the Bench of Bishops should no longer have a seat in that House, he would support it. Hearing these strong sentiments from the noble Earl, he had then stated, that, however much he concurred with the noble Earl on the subject of the Catholic Question, nothing should induce him to vote for Reform, because the House of Commons had passed the Catholic Bill. He had not the paper by him in which his opinions on that occasion were stated, for he certainly had not expected to be called on his legs in this manner to defend himself. The noble Lords opposite fancied that their opponents had been too tame yesterday, and, acting on the forbearance shown, they now came forward with charges of inconsistency. It was objected to him that he had opposed the disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders in Ireland. He had so; but what then? If he were inconsistent in having then opposed disfranchisement, and in supporting it now, what became of those noble Lords on the opposite side who voted for that measure, and who now opposed this Bill? Why was disfranchisement to be supported then, and to be opposed now? Why was the principle of vested rights to be held sacred when it applied to St. Mawe's, and Gatton, and Old Sarum, and to be set at nought when it affected the franchises of 250,000 freeholders? He would beg to call the recollection of their Lordships to what he had said on the occasion of the disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders. It was true, that he had strenuously opposed that measure; but he said that, if that bill passed, a year would not elapse without some general measure of Reform being called for. He begged to deny that he was inconsistent in having opposed that measure, and in supporting the present, for he defied the noble Earl—he defied any man—to say that he ever spoke against Reform. On the contrary, since he had a seat in Parliament, it was to him a matter of surprise how any man could get up and defend the system of nomination boroughs.

The Earl of *Falmouth* wished merely to observe, in reply to the noble Duke's remark with regard to the 40*s*. freeholders, that he had not voted on that occasion to which the noble Duke had alluded, and, therefore, was free from any charge of inconsistency on that head, however the noble Duke himself might be affected by the charge.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* said, that, when he saw the noble Duke with whom he had acted in opposing the 40*s*. Freeholder Disfranchisement Bill, which he had ever considered as one of the grossest spoliations that had ever been attempted—when he saw that noble Duke now defending his consistency in supporting another attempt at spoliation, he wished to ask was there not a great difference in the two cases? He would ask him whether the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill was not supported on the understanding that it was to be accompanied, or followed, immediately by the 40*s*. Freeholder Disfranchisement Bill? and was not the Catholic Bill considered, at the time, to be a full compensation for any loss which might be sustained by the disfranchisement measure? Did the 40*s*. freeholders themselves complain of the measure as an act of injustice, or rather did they not gladly receive the one as a compensation for the other? But let him ask the noble Duke, did any thing like the same circumstances exist with respect to those whom it was now proposed to disfranchise? If he saw the expediency of the proposed measure, he might concur in it; but no expediency could justify such a robbery as had then been committed. Such was, in effect, the language of the noble Duke, in his address to the House on that occasion; but, in the protest which the noble Duke had entered upon the journals, his language was still stronger. Indeed, to such a length did the noble Duke carry his opinion about the invasion of vested rights in that protest, that, though he (the noble Marquis) had come down to the House for the purpose of joining in it, he found it went to such a length in that respect, that even he, concurring as he did in many of the noble Duke's objections to the measure, could not consent to affix his name to it. But the noble Duke, who was so tender with respect to the franchise of the 40*s*. freeholder had no such scruples with respect to the franchises of the freemen of Arundel and other boroughs, which, without mercy, he would consign to schedule A. He had no doubt of the noble Duke's sincerity in the opinions he now entertained, for he presumed he would not be sitting where he was if he did not enter cordially into the opinions of his colleagues; but he owned he should like to hear from the noble Duke the grounds of the distinction which he now made between the Irish 40*s*. freeholders and the freemen of the borough of Arundel. It was singular that the noble Duke should have so different an opinion on that subject which all his colleagues had supported, However noble Lords might have changed their opinions on the principle of expediency, he had not changed his, and he could not express too strongly his feelings in favour of claims which, it appeared, the noble Duke was prepared to throw overboard.

The Marquis of *Cleveland:* My Lords, after what has fallen from some of the noble Lords opposite, and from my noble friend near me, in this conversation—for I cannot call it discussion—I cannot allow the subject to drop without adding a few words. As the subject of nomination boroughs has been mentioned, I may say that there are few individuals who have had a greater interest in that description of borough than he who now has the honour to address your Lordships. My interests in such boroughs has been as great as those of any other noble Lord, and greater than those of most others; but I may appeal to those who have known what my political life has been, whether I have not been, throughout the whole of that life, a stedfast Reformer. Ever since I have had a seat in Parliament, and more particularly ever since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, which I have now had from a date so far back as the year 1792, I have been a steady supporter of the cause of Reform, and, at the same time, an anxious acquirer of parliamentary influence. From the period which I have mentioned, though I was then young in age, and scarcely advanced beyond the threshold of political existence, I saw those who were in the same rank in life with myself, and in possession of the same means, busily engaged in appropriating to themselves all the parliamentary influence which they could possibly acquire. I, too, endeavoured to obtain similar influence from a conviction that it was necessary to counteract the influence of intriguing and designing men. I state this frankly and broadly to your Lordships, and I am happy to have this opportunity of doing so. I saw the individuals to whom I have alluded regularly engaged in supporting measures which I deemed detrimental to the best interests of my country. From the year 1792, when a mad crusade was preached against the liberties of mankind, and when an unjust and unnecessary war was on the point of commencing for the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, which they have again lost, by their imbecility, bigotry, and oppression—from the year 1792, I date the origin of all the great misfortunes of the country. That is my humble opinion, be it right or be it wrong; I think that to that period the origin of our enormous debt, our heavy taxation, our immense establishments—in a word, the origin of all that creates and aggravates our present distress—may be clearly and distinctly traced. At that period I first entertained the thought of acquiring that parliamentary influence which I was afterwards so successful in acquiring. Enjoying, then, as I do, considerable borough property, I differ widely from those noble Lords who call this Bill, which aims at its destruction, a Bill of robbery and spoliation. I conceive that the desire of acquiring property of this description arises from two motives—either from the desire of obtaining and exercising parliamentary influence, or from the desire, of which I am sure that your Lordships could not support the bare idea —I mean the desire of deriving pecuniary advantage from the sale of seats. This latter motive is so indefensible, both in practice and in theory, that I am convinced that it is unnecessary for me to urge a single reason in proof of its impropriety. As to the former motive, the desire of acquiring parliamentary influence, I have only to say, that if it be a crime, I must plead guilty to the commission of it. I did seek parliamentary influence, and that, too, with great anxiety; but I sought it with a view of counteracting the measures of men, whom from that day to this I have continually, and without any exception, opposed to the uttermost. A noble Baron (Lord Ellenborough), who spoke with great ability yesterday, in reply to my noble friend near me (Earl Grey), took occasion, in the course of his observations, to assert, that the Whigs had gone over in a body, or, at least, with the exception of a very small portion of them, to support the Administration of a right hon. Statesman, whose loss I sincerely deplore—I mean the late Mr. Canning. I frankly avow that I was one of those Whigs who supported the Administration of Mr. Canning. I do not regret, I am not ashamed of, that circumstance. I gave my support to Mr. Canning on principle, because I thought that, when that illustrious individual stepped into office over the wreck of the preceding arbitrary Administration, the dawn of liberal principles was beginning to shine again upon the country. In consequence of that impression I did support Mr. Canning. When his death took place, and the noble Duke succeeded to the helm of state, which was then vacant, I was proud to give the same support to the Administration of the noble Duke. I thought that the noble Duke had conferred such essential benefits upon the country by many of the great political measures which he had brought forward, that it was the duty of every man who loved his country to continue him in office. I need not enumerate to your Lordships the benefits which the noble Duke has conferred upon the country, for they are recorded in the hearts of his countrymen, and can never be forgotten. I know that the noble Duke will admit to me, that when I told him that I intended to support his Administration, I also told him that I should, upon all occasions, when it was mooted, support the cause of Parliamentary Reform; and, on that occasion—for the noble Duke had granted me a conference—the noble Duke told me as candidly that he would oppose it. I have always, upon every occasion, voted in favour of Reform; and, as long as my life lasts, I shall continue to vote in the same manner. I, therefore, heard with feelings of inexpressible satisfaction that my noble friend before me, who has honoured me with his friendship for so many years, was appointed to the head of affairs in this country; for I knew that under his auspices the cause of Reform must go on prospering and to prosper. With these feelings, then, upon my mind, I cannot refrain from congratulating your Lordships that this Bill is again laid upon your Table, from which I hope that it will not be withdrawn, until it shall receive, unshorn and unmutilated the Royal Assent. I beg leave also to offer to my noble friend at the head of the Government, and to my other noble friends who are his colleagues in the Administration, my grateful thanks for this Bill, which I look upon as the only means of rescuing the country from the abyss of misery into which the measures of former Ministers have unfortunately plunged it. It has been said that your Lordships should reject this Bill, because it is the offspring of popular clamour. My Lords, I deny the fact. The Bill is not the offspring of popular clamour: on the contrary, it is the foster-child of public opinion; and, though to popular clamour I attach but little weight, God forbid that I should not attend to public opinon. I likewise deny that there is any reaction with respect to this Bill, unless it be a reaction in its favour among the noble Lords on the other side of the House. If there be a reaction on that side of the House, it is one of the most desirable events that can happen to the country.

Lord *Howard of Effingham* said, that he could not agree with the noble Earl who had risen on the other side of the House (the Earl of Falmouth), in thinking that there was any thing extraordinary in the circumstance of any noble Lord supporting Reform now, who had opposed it three years ago. The circumstances of the country, and, indeed, of the world, were so changed in the last two years, that the question appeared at present in a very different light from that in which it had ever been previously exhibited. If the noble Earl meant to deny that proposition, he must be blind to the changes which had been occurring almost daily in Europe. There had been a Revolution in France; there had been a Revolution in Belgium: and the changes which had occurred in those countries had produced a corresponding change in this. As long as the nomination boroughs were the objects of popular acquiescence, so long they might hold good; but, as soon as popular opinion directed itself against them, they must totter to their fall. Property in them there was none—at least none that was legal; and, therefore, the destruction of it could not be justly entitled a spoliation. He would conclude by stating it to be his opinion, that the decisive expression of popular opinion was a fair and legitimate reason for consenting to this measure of Reform.

The Earl of *Falmouth* observed, that, in the remarks which he had offered to the House, he had not meant any thing personal to any of their Lordships.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* rose to notice the very extraordinary speech which had just been delivered by the noble Marquis, who had volunteered explanations wholly uncalled for. It was a strange exposition of the political power which the noble Marquis had acquired, and of the mode in which he, who professed himself to be a steady Reformer, had exercised it. It was to him (the Marquis of Londonderry) very remarkable, that with all those liberal principles which the noble Marquis declared influenced him, that he should have been the constant and undeviating supporter of every Administration which had been in power for this many a-year. The noble Marquis then went on as follows—"If I were a Reformer, I should say that I did not want a proof of the necessity of destroying all borough property, after the monstrous case which the noble Marquis has this evening made out against himself. The appearance which the noble Marquis has cut before us his fellow Peers, is in my mind passing strange. He has formally come down to us for the purpose of stating his own disinterestedness, and of declaring his intention to sacrifice his borough property on the altar of patriotism. I don't mean to say, that the noble Marquis has not a patriotic object in view; I dare say he has: but if I were in possession of large borough property, which unfortunately I am not, and if I wished to make the most of it when the Reform question was before the House, I should certainly come forward like the noble Marquis and declare my intention of supporting this Bill. And I'll tell your Lordships why I would do this. If the Bill passes, and a noble proprietor parts with his boroughs, it is very easy to suppose that the noble Earl who dispenses the favour of the Crown, may act in some such way as this —for instance, a Viscount may be created an Earl, an Earl a Marquis, and so on to the highest station in the Peerage. It is possible that in some such way, if the Bill passes, the noble proprietors of boroughs may get a compensation for the property which they professed to sacrifice; but if we reject the Bill, as I hope, and trust, and believe that we shall, the noble Marquis will still retain his boroughs, and I do not despair of seeing him still seated on that side of the House in full possession of them, even though another noble Peer should then be Prime Minister. I think that if this Bill passes, I shall have greater parliamentary interest than I have at present, owing to my connexion with several large commercial towns: but I am not an individual to be influenced by such a consideration. The noble Marquis, however, is connected with the county of Durham; and when I look to that county, I see, that, if he has no other reward, he will have his reward there from the great preponderance of new boroughs created within its limits. I have great esteem and respect for the noble Marquis; but if this Bill goes into the Committee—where it never shall go if I can prevent it—I shall have great pleasure in discussing with him the propriety of giving so many additional Members to the county of Durham, which I pronounce the most gross of all the Whig jobs in this disgraceful Whig-jobbing Bill."

The Marquis of *Cleveland:* I rise once more to address your Lordships in consequence of the gross personal attack which the noble Marquis has just made upon me. I am averse to continue a conversation which is at all times irregular, and which, on the present occasion, ought on every account to have been avoided. When there is such an important question as that now on the orders of the day standing for discussion, we are improperly trespassing on the time of the House—and, I may also add, on the time of the public —when we indulge in these petty, and puerile imputations one against the other. At the same time, in consequence of the petulant remarks of the noble Marquis, in vindication of my own conduct, and in total contrariety of the assertions of the noble Marquis, I must stand forward for a few minutes in defence of my political character. With respect to any favours, grants, places, allowances, or honours, I disclaim before your Lordships, and before my country, any idea or conception that any will be conferred on me. I flatter myself that I am as independent a man in every respect as any one of your Lordships. I am independent in every respect—ay, as independent as the noble Marquis is, or as any of the noble Lords by whom he is supported. With respect to the support which I have given to Parliamentary Reform, I have acted independently, looking neither to the right nor to the left for compensation or reward, but keeping one object always distinctly in view — the advantage of my country. I am not obliged either to one Government or to another. I have not been the supporter of all Governments indiscriminately. In contradiction to the assertion of the noble Marquis, I beg leave to state, that I have been for many, very many years, a constant opponent of the Government. From the year 1792 down to the year 1827 I felt it my duty to act in constant opposition to the Government of the day. I am not accustomed to public speaking, and therefore may not address your Lordships as clearly as I wish. The noble Marquis may not have apprehended what I intended to say. I will, therefore, in contradiction to the noble Marquis, who asserts that I have been the supporter of all the Governments under which I have lived, repeat that I have had the misfortune — for such the noble Marquis will consider it—to be in constant opposition to every Administration from 1792 to 1827, and that is no small interval in a man's life. I took my political principles early in life from my noble friend now before me. On these principles I acted with undeviating constancy, for more than a quarter of a century, through good report and through bad report. When Mr. Canning became Premier, I thought that the dawn of liberal principles was bursting upon us, and I therefore considered it my duty to support his Government. In the interval between 1827 and 1832 I supported the Governments of the Duke of Wellington and of my noble friend the present Premier, and as I have before stated the ground on which I supported them, I will not fatigue the House by restating them now. With regard to the influence which the noble Marquis asserts I shall possess in the county of Durham I beg leave to add a few words. — [*Cries of* "*spoke, spoke,*" "*Question, question.*"] I am sorry to detain your Lordships from the debate of the evening, which I admit is of far greater consequence than my character, or even that of the noble Marquis. But as I have been personally attacked, I trust to the candour of your Lordships to hear me in reply. As I seldom trespass upon your attention, I might claim your attention on this occasion. All that I have to say is, that I never have made any use of that influence to induce any Administration to bestow on me either place, government, or pension—that I never asked a favour of a Minister which induced him to leave, among his memoranda, the celebrated inscription of "This is too bad." I assure your Lordships that when I had the honour of being promoted by his late Majesty to my present rank, the honour was unasked and unsolicited by me. I sit on this bench behind my noble friends on this side of the House, because I look upon them as the statesmen best qualified to bring the nation through the difficulties under which it has long been labouring, and because I believe them to have the good of their country at heart. I support them independently and disinterestedly, and I shall continue to give them that support until I find them unworthy of it.

The Marquis of *Londonderry:* One word in explanation. I can assure the noble Marquis that I meant no personal attack upon him. He opened his views respecting the exercise of parliamentary influence, and I made, as I had an undeniable right to make, my comments upon them. I did not speak of the whole political life of the noble Marquis. I spoke only of his political conduct during the last seven years. In that time there have been four different Governments; their opinions have been wide as the Poles asunder; and yet the noble Marquis has supported them, one and all.

The Duke of *Wellington* did not rise to prolong a conversation which in every respect was irregular, and which could not in any way promote the business of the House. He only rose to say, in reply to the call of the noble Marquis opposite, that it was perfectly true, that he (the Duke of Wellington) had had the honour of the noble Marquis's support and assistance whilst in the Administration, and that nothing ever passed between them which was not highly honourable to the public and private character of the noble Marquis. He had no recollection of the particular conversation to which the noble Marquis had referred, though he had no doubt that it must have occurred; for in all the transactions which he had with the noble Marquis, he had found the conduct of the noble Marquis to be at once fair, candid, and manly.

Earl *Grey* said, he understood the question before their Lordships was, whether a petition from Arundel respecting certain boundaries to be fixed by a bill not yet on the Table should be brought up or not. He had listened with the deepest regret for more than three-quarters of an hour to the turn which this discussion had taken, during all which time, however, he had not been fortunate enough to hear one word relating to the question really before their Lordships. On the contrary, he had heard nothing save that which appeared to him a most extraordinary fact—namely, that this petition had been made the peg on which to hang a debate full of acrimonious personalities and imputations as to the motives of the different Peers who had taken a prominent part in supporting and attacking the Reform Bill. It was not consistent either with the orders of the House or with the advantages of the public, that the motives of their Lordships should be thus scrutinized and discussed. He wished their Lordships to consider whether this was the occasion on which a discussion of this angry and personal nature could be prosecuted with advantage, if indeed such an occasion could ever be found. For what was the question which stood for their Lordships' consideration? A great question of constitutional policy, in which it was possible, though he hoped that it was not probable, that their decision might not be in accordance with that of the people. On such a question he should think that it would be the wish, as well as the interest of their Lordships, that the decision should be devoid of every thing that savoured of personal irritation. And yet what was it that he had heard that evening, save crimination and recrimination, bandied from one side of the House to the other? So that it would appear that none of their Lordships would vote except from some personal motives. [" *No,*" *from the Earl of Falmouth.*] The noble Earl said no: but what could be the object of the noble Earl's attack on his noble friend (the Duke of Richmond), if it were not to throw some imputation on his personal motives? [The Earl of *Falmouth*: " *No, no.*"] No! what, then, was the object of his attack? Why was it made? A discussion had arisen injurious to the character of the House, and inconsistent with the calm and dispassionate consideration which it was their duty to apply to the grave and important subject which awaited their decision. He had hoped most earnestly and sincerely that their Lordships would have approached this subject without extracting from it the bitterness of useless personality. Why such an abortive produce should be forced from it now, he would not take upon him to inquire; but he must be permitted to say, that he held as highly objectionable a discussion of this nature preceding so momentous a question as that which they were assembled to determine—a discussion tending to impute to public persons in that House motives not consistent with the interests of the community, nor advantageous to their Lordships. He felt himself called upon to say thus much, which, as the discussion was likely to cease, was perhaps unnecessary. He must at the same time declare his feeling of the independent conduct of the noble Duke who had been made the subject of uncalled-for observations. While he stated that no one could display more true independence of character than that noble Duke, he trusted that this mode of introducing irrelevant topics would not be persevered in.

The Earl of *Falmouth* was not sure that he had committed a breach of regularity, for he had risen merely to remark upon the change of opinion which the noble Duke entertained, and not by any means to attribute motives to the noble Duke. For the noble Duke he entertained every respect, and should be ashamed to attribute to him any thing inconsistent with a course of uprightness and honour. He begged to disavow the use of observations more than were warranted by a wish to explain what he had before said; and even if he had trespassed a little on this score, he conceived that the last Member of that House by whom he should have been rebuked was the noble Earl who last addressed the House, to whose character and abilities so much and such frequent indulgence had been conceded in the way of explanation.

Petition laid on the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND—SECOND READING—SECOND DAY.] The Order of the Day being read for resuming the debate on the Reform Bill,

The Earl of *Shrewsbury* rose, and spoke to the following effect:—It is impossible for me, my Lords, to suffer this stage of so important a measure to pass without making a few observations upon it. Amidst the variety of conflicting arguments which are urged for and against any measure which is brought forward, it is something at least to acknowledge that it is expedient to yield to necessity. The noble Duke opposite, whose opinions must always be received with respect, has acknowledged that principle in a former measure of great and vital importance; and I think, therefore, that he ought to be the last man in your Lordships' House to vote that it is dishonourable or unbecoming in us to yield to agitation. The misfortune is, that agitation, hitherto, has been the sole remedy for the grievances of the people. But, if the noble and gallant Duke opposite yielded to agitation in 1829, so will he do well in yielding to agitation now; and so will every man in your Lordships' House do well in yielding that to agitation which should long since have been conceded to entreaty. But, my

Lords, I say that policy and justice combine to sanction the irresistible demands of the people. Agitation is undoubtedly an evil; it is a dangerous means of obtaining justice; and this is the reason why I desire to see the present system altered, and the grievances of the country redressed by the great influence of a real and effective representation of the people. It appears to me, my Lords, that the Constitution of this country has never yet been anything but a beautiful theory, subject to perpetual contradiction in practice. I do not see, so far as I can collect from the history of this nation, that we have ever yet been free from the evils which are incident to other societies and to other forms of Government. We have been perpetually engaged in most wasteful and unjust wars —wars in which the true interests of the country have had but little share, and which have encumbered us with 800,000,000*l.* of debt. We have been afflicted from time to time with tyranny, with anarchy, with civil war, with rebellion and revolution. We have felt at times commercial embarrassments to a degree unknown in other countries. We have a poor and unemployed population—a population starving in the midst of plenty. Of late years crime has been increased, both in atrocity and in frequency, to an extent beyond all precedent. We know, from the history of the country, that there have been times when the management of public affairs has been marked by the most profligate corruption in every department of the State; and the observation which I am now about to make applies to all periods, —namely, that we have always had a Government supporting itself by patronage, and keeping up a large army of occupation, and a numerous catalogue of useless and burthensome offices. We have seen this system pursued, until the people, driven to desperation by their evils and their sufferings, have risen with one accord, determined to emancipate themselves from a state of oppression which they could endure no longer. We shall now, I trust, see—and, in my opinion, it will be for the first time—we shall see this Constitution, which we have always been too fond of boasting of, become worthy of the praises which are bestowed upon it. This Bill will give it fair play—it will develope all its parts; and, while it calls forth the powers of the different parts, will give a freedom and activity to the whole, producing an energy and activity which have hitherto been unknown, and for ever annihilating that deadly monopoly, created by what I must call—although it is a strong phrase—an oppressive oligarchy which has ruled this country for so many years, and usurped every privilege and every prerogative of the different branches of the State, the independence of the Legislature, and the liberties of the people. This system, my Lords, carries the seeds of dissolution within itself and tends to compromise the existence of your own body. Your extravagance—your disregard of the interests of the country—your absolute tyranny over the people of Ireland—the bitter fruits of which you are now reaping —all these things are exposed in their true light, until, in my opinion, we now stand for judgment before the people. The judgment has been pronounced, and our only hope of pardon is, to sue for it in this act of justice. Pass this Bill, my Lords, and all your power will be restored —not the power which you have hitherto possessed of doing mischief—and the miserable condition of the country affords indisputable proofs of the extent to which you have availed yourselves of that prerogative—but the power of doing good, by co-operating with the people for the benefit of all, and the regeneration of the empire. But if we continue legislating for ourselves alone, seeking to promote our own interests at the expense of the interests of the country, the consequences of that vicious course will recoil upon ourselves. The sooner such Legislation ceases the better. If we wish to preserve our privileges we must proceed upon a good and sound view, and not upon any extravagant ideas of the stable and imperishable nature of those distinctions. We must right the people or the people will right themselves, and this irritating contest in which we have been engaged will have its issue in some dreadful and terrible national disaster. My Lords, after the speech which was made last night by a right reverend Prelate, in opposition to this Bill, I would beg leave to address one word to that portion of the House of which the right reverend Prelate forms a part. If the clergy know their own interest—and it is generally supposed that they do—I am sure that they ought to be the first to stand forward and do their duty to the country and the people. Hitherto they have too often shown themselves indifferent to the public good. They have been but too often the willing agents of every system of tyranny and persecution. They have been the promoters of that extravagance and spoliation with which this country has been afflicted at the hands of ambitious and self-interested men. But, my Lords, the time has now arrived—the opportunity is now come—when it will be seen whether they are capable of appreciating the spirit of the times, and of endeavouring, as far as lies in their power, to remedy the evils which they have had too large a share in producing. I would also take the liberty of addressing a few words to those noble Lords who intend to vote for the second reading of the Bill, with a view to bring it into a snare, in which they will be able readily to defeat it. My Lords, it appears to me that it would be much better that they should oppose the Bill *in limine*—that they should manfully stand forward in support of their own opinions, fight the battle boldly, and desist from that desultory warfare which they are about to wage against the measure; for, I believe that such a course will bring it into a snare from which the Government will not easily be able to extricate it. My Lords, the Minister, be he who he may, must, under the existing circumstances of the country—indeed I may say under all circumstances—he must command a majority in this House, or he has no alternative but to resign. In the present state of things I cannot look at that alternative without alarm; for, my Lords, I think that the resignation of the noble Earl now at the head of his Majesty's Government will not only be the death-blow of all the well-earned fame of a long political life, but in my opinion it will be the signal for anarchy and confusion in the country. The Minister, as I already said, must command a Majority in this House—not, as heretofore, by the interested means of corrupt and ruinous abuse of the public resources—not by keeping up a disproportionate number of offices in the army and navy, with an enormous civil patronage—not by translating a right reverend Prelate from a poorer to a richer see, or by advancing noble Lords from a lower to a higher degree of the Peerage—not by reinforcing this House with every man who has voted for a certain number of years in support of the Minister—not by sinecures or pensions, nor by giving large emoluments for small services; but by honestly and steadily pursuing the interests of the country, and suffering themselves to be guided by public opinion; for, in general, public opinion will be seen to be right. If we do not allow him to carry on the Government of the country on these principles, I see no other consequence but that your Lordships' House must be filled with men of different principles. I shall not detain your Lordships much longer. I shall merely express my opinion upon one point. It may be founded on erroneous views, but I will not blink the matter. It appears to me, my Lords, that if the House of Commons be Reformed, this House must also be Reformed, for otherwise there will be a constant collision between the two Houses, and no practical Government can be carried on.

The Earl of *Limerick* said, that, of all the extraordinary speeches he had ever heard, he must say the speech made by the noble Earl who had just sat down, was the most extraordinary. He himself had been a sincere friend of Catholic Emancipation, but little had he expected, as one of the first fruits of it to have heard a noble Lord, who occupied a seat in that House in consequence of the passing of that Bill, get up and pronounce a violent phillippic, not only against existing Peers, but also against all Peers who had existed for the last century. The noble Earl had condemned the working of the Constitution as administered by men under whose Government this unfortunate country, England, had arrived at the proudest condition which any country had ever reached. He had arraigned the conduct of England, who stood alone against the world in arms, and asserted her liberty and her independence. The noble Earl said, that we had spent 800,000,000*l*. of money. But he had omitted to state for what purpose that expense had been incurred. Was it not to preserve England and all Europe from the tyranny of one who otherwise would have reduced the whole into a mere province of his empire? He was rather surprised at one part of the noble Earl's speech. The noble Earl had made use of an unfortunate expression in repeating the word agitation; he had asserted, "That agitation had hitherto been the sole remedy for the grievances of the people." Did the noble Earl, by that expression mean to encourage the present violent proceedings in Ireland? He had been the advocate of emancipation—desirous of setting free the Catholics of Ireland, who made every possible profession—who took oaths and made declarations—who assumed the guise and manner of liberality; and what was now the result? He would ventnre to assert that there was not one of those oaths, not one of those declarations, which had not been falsified. He lamented, and with sorrow lamented, the course he had pursued on the Catholic Question, and he thought it manly even now to come forward and avow his regret. Ireland was now disturbed by an alarming and well-organized system of intimidation, carried on by a party whose first object was the overthrow of the Established Churches of England and Ireland; for, although the noble Earl (the Earl of Shrewsbury), perhaps, was not aware of it, the two Churches of England and Ireland were knit together, and one could not fall without bringing down the other.

The Earl of *Shrewsbury* said, his argument appeared to have been misapprehended.

The Earl of *Limerick* said, the noble Earl would have an opportunity of explaining hereafter, but he must be aware that when he started such doctrines as he had done with respect to the Established Church, the discussion in which such doctrines were propounded could not easily be carried on with all that moderation which it was admitted was so desirable in discussing the Bill now on the Table. The people of Ireland had other tutors besides the noble Earl, and he hoped they did not act in concert, but the remarks the noble Earl had indulged in coincided very materially with those made use of by such persons as avowed their present object to be, to overturn the Established Church in Ireland, but the two Churches of this country and Ireland were knit together, and one could not fall without the other. A paper which he had received that morning contained a speech made by the principle agitator in Ireland, in which he said, that it would be requisite to allot the number of Protestant Ministers that might be necessary for the service of the few Protestants in the country. He further said, that if the Reform Bill should pass—and he had no doubt that it would—the infusion of new blood into the Legislature would enable the Irish to obtain their favourite advocates, and their favourite objects. Their Lordships were told by the noble Earl, that England had tyrannized over Ireland, and that they were now reaping the bitter fruits of it. Had England, who had thrown open her ports to Ireland, who, by admitting her produce on equal footing with her own, had enabled her to advance in comfort and riches deserved this remark? Again agitation had been stated by the noble Earl to be the powerful lever by which she was to obtain her rights. What had it already produced but insubordination, sedition, and nearly rebellion? By agitation a contemptible knot of low people had been enabled to convulse Ireland, and to dictate to England a measure which had shaken England to its centre, and had mainly contributed to produce the melancholy crisis in which they were now involved. The petitions of the great majority had been disregarded, and England had ceased to be a Protestant country. "Such a number of clergymen only should be allotted as were sufficient for the small number of Protestants, and, as they diminished, so should the number of their Ministers." So spoke one of their agitators. Was this the return that England was to receive from Ireland for the benefits she had conferred, after relieving Ireland from her debt—after relieving her from almost all internal taxation—after placing Ireland, as to her commerce, on exactly the same footing as England? Ireland had few manufactures, and yet by the great encouragement given to her agriculture, by throwing open the ports of England to her commerce, she was rapidly improving, and would attain soon a high state of prosperity, if her turbulent and seditious agitators would permit her to be tranquil. He had heard much of the Irish nation, but he did not conceive that such a nation existed. In Ireland there were three classes: first, the settlers from Scotland, an industrious, gallant, and religious people; next, the settlers from England possessed of a vast proportion of the property, intelligence and liberality of the country from whence they came, and attached, from interest as well as affection, to that country. To that class he had the honor to belong, and he was determined to adhere to England with the utmost fidelity. The third class were the descendants of the old Irish, numerous, indeed, but possessed of little of the real property of the country, sunk in the most degrading superstition, and completely under the control of a bigoted priesthood, drawn almost solely from the lowest peasantry, and educated in a college, which it would be well for the interests of Ireland if it never had existed, and which now, when Protestant establishments were suppressed, ought also to be abolished. He made these remarks in connexion with the Bill then before the House, for when he translated the meaning of the language uttered by the great agitator, which he had just quoted, he was convinced that the result of its passing would be, to return such Representatives to Parliament as would accomplish the two great objects the agitators had at heart, which were the destruction of the Protestant Church in Ireland, and the separation of Ireland from Great Britain. On these grounds he was prepared to vote for the Amendment.

The Earl of *Mansfield* spoke as follows:—My Lords—Having addressed your Lordships at great length in the last Session, I am very unwilling to obtrude myself on the present occasion, more especially as the difficulty of finding new topics or arguments, which have not been used, has been greatly increased by the luminous speech of my noble friend, the noble Baron who moved the Amendment. The first question which I proposed to myself was, is there any alteration in this Bill which affects the principle to which I objected when the former Bill was submitted to your consideration?—and that question having been answered in the negative, the line of conduct which I ought to take appeared to me clear and distinct. But when I found that some noble Lords, who had so eloquently opposed the second reading of the former Bill, intended to carry this to the Committee (of which intention the public had been for some time aware), I thought it my duty to reconsider my objections, to examine whether there had been anything unfounded or exaggerated in my apprehensions; and I can with great truth assure your Lordships, that if I had been convinced that I had been in error, I would frankly have avowed it; I would not have been deterred by the fear of having inconsistency imputed to me, though I might have trespassed on your Lordships' indulgence, while I stated the course of reasoning by which that change had been effected. If, however, the change had not been the result of conviction; if, after having declared my determination to defend the Constitution against attacks, (not against improvement —that is a mistake—) but against direct attacks, I had yielded to threats from fear of dangers, the existence of which I do not deny, or to the more specious argument as to the hopelessness of resistance; then I believe I should not have had the front to have addressed you. I should have given a silent vote; I could not even have been encouraged by example, or by the commendations which might have been bestowed upon this prudent, timely, submission. I have said, if I could have been convinced of my former error; for it was with astonishment that I heard a noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby) declare, on a former evening, that, in consequence of the alteration which had been made in the provisions of this Bill, his objections to its principles were in some degree removed. I had the advantage of hearing the same noble Earl address the House last Session, in a speech which I assisted in circulating, because I considered it to contain the best exposition of the defects of the measure. From what has recently passed, however, I now suppose that I must have entirely mistaken the nature of the noble Earl's objections. It is unfortunate that the arguments which the noble Earl then so eloquently addressed to the House appeared to have made a more durable impression on the minds of the House than on his own. The noble Earl, however, must be the best judge whether the alterations which have been made in the Bill are such as ought to remove his objections to its principle. A noble friend of mine (the Earl of Haddington) last night gave another reason for supporting the second reading of the Bill—a reason to which I am at any time little disposed to yield—namely, expediency. For my part I am confirmed in my opinion of the propriety of opposing the second reading by the observations which fell from a noble Baron (Lord Wharncliffe) on a former evening. That noble Baron said, that the details of the Bill are objectionable, but that he thought its principle, after all, the one upon which all Bills for the Reform of the Representation must be grounded. If this be the case, then, I must object to all. I agree with the noble Earl at the head of the Government in thinking, that much would be gained should the Bill pass the second reading. It would, in fact, be saying, that the ancient Constitution of Parliament must be changed, leaving it to the

Committee to find a substitute by which that Constitution might be replaced. The noble Earl, when he addressed the House last night, seemed to think that the principle of the Bill was generally, if not universally, admitted. As I do not wish to affect singularity, I have taken the trouble to consult some of my friends for whose opinions I entertain a very high respect, and am happy to find that they, like myself, are opposed to the principle of this Bill. It is my humble opinion that there is no necessity for Reform arising out of any defects in the state of the Representation. I may be told, as I have been before, both in this House and elsewhere, that this is to deprive the people of all hope. I can only say, such is not my intention, neither, as I conceive, would this be the effect of your Lordships' vote, to which, and not to the opinions of any individual, importance would be attached. But of this opinion, with your Lordships' indulgence, I will give some explanation. If we see (for I am happy to say that I need not employ the singular number), if we see that the people have been persuaded that their comfort and happiness would be materially increased by a change in the Representation, and that that change, though necessary, meets with continued, and, as they think, unjustifiable, resistance, may we not be permitted to express a doubt as to the existence of that necessity? for, if it did exist, no man would be more ready to admit that Parliament should immediately take the subject into consideration, and, if possible, should not separate without applying a remedy. For my own part, my Lords, I am not, from prejudice, opposed to all change, but require that there should be a hope that the change will be attended by real, not speculative, advantages; and of the reality, I say on behalf of your Lordships, you must be the judges; otherwise, in what consist your legislative functions? It is one thing to admit the possibility of improvement, and another to admit the existence of an evil to which an immediate remedy must be applied; and, if I were to say (which is my belief), that the country could go on increasing in wealth and prosperity as it has done since 1792, the people enjoy national liberty under excellent laws, fairly administered, although certain anomalies, to which allusion has been made, were suffered to exist, I should only be taking that ground which, by the admission of Reformers themselves, has been allowed to be good for those who adhere to the system under which they have enjoyed practical advantages, and reject theories, which cannot be founded on experience. But I do not push the argument so far. I think your Lordships should consider any plan, and even adopt it, if it were not objectionable, but, in my opinion, no Reform can be desirable, if it be founded on injustice. And an attempt should be made to persuade the people that the evil of delay would be preferable to the danger of falling into irretrievable errors by inconsiderate, and, I must say, nothwithstanding all the discussion which has taken place on the Bill, precipitate Legislation. In advocating the necessity of delay, I think I shall have the support of all the boroughs, which, by the first Bill, were to have lost their franchise, but are now to have one Member, and of those other boroughs, which, by the former Bills, would have been partially or wholly disfranchised, but are now to retain both their Representatives. The measure before the House is the third Bill on this subject which has been presented to Parliament. Is it better or worse than its predecessor? I must give Ministers the credit of supposing that it is better, although I beg to remind the House, that one of the threats held out to induce us to agree to the former Bill was, that if it should be rejected, a worse would be proposed in its place. If the present Bill, however, be better than that which preceded it, the country is indebted for the improvement to the wise interposition of this House, and, therefore, we may hope (though I confess that I am not sanguine) that, in the event of the rejection of the present Bill, another still less objectionable will be submitted to our consideration. But are we the only persons who doubted the necessity of Reform? In 1830 a motion was made in the House of Commons for leave to bring in a Bill for Reform of Parliament, which was negatived, as well as an amendment which called upon that House to resolve that Reform was expedient. The House could not have resolved that that which was necessary was inexpedient. Are not those who oppose Reform to take advantage of the decision to which the House of Commons came upon that occasion? If the necessity for Reform exist at the present moment, it must have arisen from circumstances, which have occurred since February, 1830. What were those circumstances? The noble Earl (the Earl of Shrewsbury) seems to think, that we have forgotten the events which took place in France and Belgium. In my opinion they have contributed to place us in our present predicament. It is admitted on all hands, that these events, operating upon congregated masses of the electors, threw the country into a ferment, and it is in such times that the wish for Reform has invariably been expressed. Then, my Lords, followed the change of Administration. The noble Earl and his friends succeeded to office. The noble Secretary of State for the Home Department last night asked, how Ministers could possibly refrain from redeeming the pledges which they gave, to bring forward a measure of Reform? Ministers must be the best judges of the obligations which they have imposed upon themselves; but every one must allow, that they have chosen a most unfavourable moment for obtaining a calm and temperate discussion of the question. It must, in justice, be acknowledged that the noble Earl has redeemed his pledge. Unfortunately, however, it sometimes happens, that men who have been long in opposition give pledges and promises to which a more extended meaning is attached than they themselves intended, and which, when they afterwards come to be placed in office, they find it equally irksome to perform, and difficult to evade. I fear that the noble Earl, when he was proceeding with perfect good faith to redeem his pledge, listened to the advice of those who entertained more extensive views of innovation; and the consequence was, the adoption of a plan in conformity with those suggestions. My noble friend near me (the Duke of Wellington) gave a simple but admirable description of the scheme which was then submitted to Parliament, when he said, that it effected a great and important alteration in the Representation of England, that it produced a change almost amounting to revolution in the Representation of Scotland, and in Ireland it destroyed what had been considered by Parliament the only safe-guard of Protestant ascendancy. Much has been said of the excitement which prevails relative to the question of Reform, and I cannot help observing, that the Ministers seem desirous of directing that excitement in their own favour. In times of excitement the cry for Reform has always been heard, but, under the sanction of Ministers, it is certainly more general on the present occasion than it has ever been before. I must contend that the conduct of Ministers has not been, like that of others, distinguished by prudence. Men in their situation know that there is inflammable matter in the mass of the people, and have, therefore, abstained from applying the torch. The noble Earl has stated, that the wealth and property of the country are in favour of the measure. Now, it is my conviction, after attentive inquiry, that the great mass of the property of the country is opposed to this Bill, and particularly to such of its provisions as recommend it to those who have a numerical superiority. But the advocates of Reform have now taken a new ground. They say, "we will no longer discuss the necessity of Reform, arising from defects of the Constitution, because that is a point upon which we cannot agree. You must admit a necessity arising from the state of the public mind." I interpret this proposition in the following way:—"We have excited—we have deluded the people—we have placed the country and your Lordships in a predicament from which you cannot be extricated, unless you consent to a measure of which you cannot approve." The force of this reasoning I can by no means approve, although it has been urged by a noble friend of mine (the Earl of Haddington), for whom I entertain a high respect. Let us suppose that the general wish of the people was for moderate Reform, and that they conceived it was to be found in the provisions of this Bill—you must act as you would do on other occasions. If the wish of the people were for the declaration of an unjust war—the continuance of peace incompatible with the honour and security of the country—if their clamour were directed against some obnoxious but innocent individuals, would you, in the first case, deviate from a prudent policy, or, in the latter, allow the even course of justice to be diverted? Certainly not: it is not for me to prescribe what your conduct should be—of this you must be the better judges; but it certainly appears to me that, if this Bill be objectionable, you must reject it. (Once for all let me be understood as assuming that postponement is equivalent to rejection): The rejection will be simple—it will not be accompanied by any explanation, but the motives by which you have been actuated will be conveyed to the public—it will be known that, without giving any declaration as to Reform, you had perceived that there was delusion as to the benefits which were to flow from this Bill, and in its principle something incurably vicious. As to the delusion, there exists a strong feeling against the nomination boroughs; and, no doubt, the people will experience some gratification from the extension of the elective franchise; but that which is generally hoped from the Bill is, relief from taxes, either by a general diminution of imposts, or by the transfer of the taxes to that class of persons in which the majority of the people are not included. Your Lordships all know that it is a fallacy to expect any result of this nature; but, at the same time, I must add, that greater pains are taken to expose this delusion on this side of the House than on the other. But, if there be delusion in the public mind, what are the objects avowed by the most eloquent Reformers? I should think they were calculated to excite just alarm. The first object is, to render the House of Commons more democratic; the second, to prevent Representatives from being independent of the electors; and, last, to prevent Ministers from being—as it is contended they now are—independent of the control of Parliament. With respect to the first, I think that the House of Commons already is, both in Constitution and conduct, democratic enough. I have observed in the House of Commons a disposition to encroach on the functions of the other branch of the Legislature—to push its inquisitorial functions to an inconvenient extent—to interfere with the right of the Crown, and with the Executive; and also I see something in its conduct which you might expect from an assembly under the influence of the people. It further appears to me, that what is called the democratic party is still gaining ground. To be sure the persons composing the party have not as yet succeeded in persuading the House of Commons to confiscate the property of the Church—to pay the Church like the army, and the army as little as possible, and to reduce the King to the situation of the President of the United States. Under a Reformed Parliament, however, all this may be accomplished; and, when I express a doubt, I beg your Lordships to observe that the most zealous and candid Reformers express none. In fact, the real power is at this moment vested in the House of Commons if it choose to exert it—it has the command of the public purse—it can control the King in the choice of his Ministers. By the constituency which this Bill provides—by the Representatives which these constituents will return—an impulsion will be given to that wish which pervades all legislative assemblies, of obtaining superiority; while, on the other hand, you destroy that influence by which alone the propensity could be restrained. As to independence of the Representatives, it is certainly true that there is a portion of the Members who are indifferent to the frowns and smiles of their constituents; but that does not apply to the greater number; and in times of excitement, that will be evident. At the last election, many Members who had performed their public duty honourably and conscientiously, and had shown the greatest attention to the local interests of their constituents, were rejected, on account of their political conduct; whilst other persons, not more estimable, were preferred, because they gave pledges, and rendered themselves delegates. It is somewhat extraordinary that your Lordships should be told that the House of Commons has passed a Bill of Reform, in compliance with the wishes of its constituents; whilst, in the same breath, it is asserted, that Reform is necessary, because, under the present system, it is impossible that the sense of the people can be represented in Parliament. Now, with respect to the last of the reasons in favour of the necessity of Reform, I stand here in the presence of existing Ministers, and of noble Lords who have filled the highest offices in the State, and I ask them on either side, whether they ever found themselves independent of the control of Parliament? I believe those noble individuals must, on many occasions, have found the House of Commons interfere with some of their schemes of public improvement. If this control were the object, it was certainly very patriotic in Ministers to forge fetters for themselves, unless, indeed, they thought that their tenure of office was insecure, and, therefore, provided them for their successors. I hope your Lordships will allow me to compare the opinions of some of those persons who are usually quoted as advocates of Reform with those expressed by Ministers; your Lordships should hear what Lord Chatham said on the subject; but I will premise that Lord Chatham was at the time in opposition, and when a person is opposing a Government his zeal for Reform is generally more violent than on other occasions, and he may not, therefore, always express himself with the greatest moderation. Lord Chatham is reported to have said—for I do not quote from authentic documents—"That there was great difference between the theory and the practice of the Constitution: and that it was necessary to reconcile them." This is exactly the language of the Reformers of the present day. Lord Chatham proceeded to say:—"According to the theory of the Constitution, there should be a constant connexion between the Representatives and the electors. Will any man say that this connexion now exists? But beware of having recourse to violent expedients." Speaking of boroughs, he applies a term which his Majesty's Ministers would think sufficiently contumelious; he says, "They are the rotten parts of the Constitution, but, like the evils of the body, we must bear them with patience, we must carry them about with us; the limb may be mortified, but amputation would be death." This eminent statesman proposed to infuse new vigour into the Representative system by giving additional Members to counties. Mr. Pitt, who adopted Lord Chatham's sentiments, proposed two plans of Reform, and a third after he was in office. The speech of Mr. Pitt made on the last occasion proved that he entertained a strong opinion as to the necessity of Reform. His plan consisted of enfranchisement and disfranchisement. He proposed to give the right of voting for counties to copyholders; that thirty-six boroughs, which he assumed to have fallen into decay, should be disfranchised, and the seventy-two Members distributed among the counties and the metropolis as Parliament might direct. That, as in the lapse of time, other boroughs would fall into decay, they should be disfranchised and the right of returning Members be transferred to populous towns. But provided that no borough should be disfranchised, and no large town acquire the right of voting, but with its own consent, anticipating what was possible, that some populous towns would not consider the right of returning Members as an advantage, and knowing that these rights were a valuable inheritance which would not be gratuitously surrendered—he proposed to establish a fund out of which they should be acquired by purchase. I shall pronounce no opinion upon the merits of this plan, but must be allowed to say, that, if persons so distinguished for vigour of mind as Lord Chatham and Mr. Pitt, and zealous in the cause of Reform, proceeded with so much caution, so much respect for vested rights, no Minister could have been ashamed to follow their example. Then came the more extensive schemes of Reform proposed by Mr. Flood, followed by those of the noble Earl: and here I would ask your Lordships' permission to read a quotation from a speech of Mr. Fox, although I think it probable that an ingenious attempt may be made to turn the argument against myself. Mr. Fox, speaking of the plan brought forward by Mr. Flood, which he describes, says, he prefers that of his hon. friend:—"My hon. friend's plan, built upon this idea, is an improvement of it, since it is not an attempt even to vary the form and outline, much less to new model the Representation of the people. It keeps every thing in its place, it neither varies the number nor changes the name, nor diverts the course of any part of our system. It corrects without a change, it extends without destruction of any established right, it restores simply what has been injured by abuse, and reinstates what time has mouldered away. No man, can have a right to complain of genuine property assailed; no habit—even no mode of thinking—no prejudice, will be wounded; it traces back the path of the Constitution from which we have wandered, but it runs out into no new direction." I will not inquire whether the plan of the noble Lord, which is not now before us, deserved that eulogium; perhaps I may think partiality for his hon. friend had affected Mr. Fox's judgment; but I think that I am entitled to say, that, for a plan to be desirable in his opinion, it must be so distinguished. Now, I would ask the noble Lords whether that be the character of the Bill? They would not even assert it; indeed I believe the authors would not like to be deprived of the merit of invention. But I would request those noble Lords who are inclined to moderate or to extensive Reform, to apply this test to any plan which may be recommended for their adoption. I oppose this Bill, and no alteration which it can receive in the Committee will remove my objections. I continue to think that, if the rights of boroughs be thus arbitrarily taken away, there can be no security for any property held by charter from the Crown—that property of every description would be endangered, and other rights between which and property a distinction is drawn, though the union of rights and property can not be dissolved. The preamble of the Bill declares, that it is expedient to deprive certain boroughs of their right of sending Members to Parliament. Now, the infirmity of my mind is such that I can not attach any meaning to rights of which the holders can be deprived, without proved delinquency, or without compensation, voluntarily received or forced upon them by the necessities of the State. Indeed I believe the greatest tyrant never committed an act of such injustice, without an attempt at palliation, either by pretending a doubt as to the existence of the right, or imputing some delinquency to his victim. It is well known that there are rights of property connected with the franchise of boroughs which have been the subject of sale. Would any man have purchased property of that description if he had not conceived it would be safe? On a former occasion I admitted that rights could, in cases of emergency, be reassumed by the Legislature, and I quoted the case of heritable jurisdictions in Scotland. These jurisdictions were quite incompatible with good government; they must have been very obnoxious to the Parliament of England, where the traces of such feudal jurisdiction had long disappeared. In fact, they had been usurped and several Sovereigns, particularly James 6th, attempted to regain them. Now, the preamble of that Bill states, that it is for remedying the inconveniences which have arisen, and may arise, from the multiplicity and extent of heritable jurisdictions, for making satisfaction to the proprietors thereof, for restoring to the Crown the power of jurisdiction, originally and properly belonging thereto according to the Constitution. Here, then, is a case in which rights, odious in themselves, which were notoriously held by prescription, and on a title originally defective, are distinctly acknowledged, and satisfaction made to the proprietors thereof. This Act passed shortly after the Union. I will appeal to any of the noble Lords connected with Scotland, and ask, whether the beginning of improvement in that country has not been attributed to that Act, and I confess I never heard the least complaint that these rights had been recovered by purchase. I now come nearer to the present time—to the Speech from the Throne in October, 1831. His Majesty, after recommending the subject of Reform to the consideration of Parliament, proceeded to express a wish for its settlement by the adoption of such improvements in the Representation as may be found necessary for securing to his people the full enjoyment of their rights—which, in combination with those of the other orders in the State are essential to the support of a free constitution. My Lords, that is, constitutionally speaking, the speech of his Majesty's Ministers. Was it, then, the intention of those Ministers that the rights of the whole people should be maintained, but, that the rights of the individuals of which that people was composed should be trampled under foot? I will not say, that this was their intention, but I appeal to the candour of your Lordships, and ask, whether their arguments would not give the words that interpretation? I beg leave here to state, that, in adverting to the different plans of Reform, I am not pretending to give an opinion on their merits. The intention of my humble efforts is, merely to protect rights from aggression, not to point out any manner in which those rights should be acquired; that is a point to be decided according to the pleasure of Parliament; all I am contending for is justice. But, My Lords, if all close boroughs could be disfranchised, would it be of any advantage to the state? I think not; and for many of the reasons which were so ably stated by the noble Earl; but, indeed, to what topic connected with the Bill did he not advert—what did he not illustrate? Here, my Lords, I must advert to some subjects which have been treated of by the noble Earl near me, more particularly with respect to the advantage it is that sons of Peers should find seats in the other House in which they might acquire the facility of public speaking, and prepare themselves for public business, and for the functions which they have to perform in this House. This is not only a great advantage to individuals—and no man can appreciate that advantage more than the humble individual who addresses you, and who has cause to regret that he never enjoyed it—but, it is a benefit to the

State, for the reasons which have been so well assigned by the noble Earl, that I would not do him the injustice to repeat them. The number of great statesmen and great orators who have represented these close boroughs is, in my mind, a great mitigation of that vice, if vice it be, of our Constitution. But at present there is a consideration which presses upon us still more. The interests of the empire are not confined to Great Britain alone. We have extensive colonial and foreign possessions, the interests of which, as well as others within the realm, are not directly represented. Whenever discussions arise on such subjects as the state of the West Indies, the renewal of the charter of the East-India Company, or of the Bank-charter, will it not be but fair that those interests should be indirectly Represented? Will it not be advantageous to the House of Commons that it should contain within itself men of experience and information to guide its decisions? My Lords, it would be perfectly impossible for many of these gentlemen to present themselves to a numerous constituency, such as will be created by this Bill, and who will probably be clamorous for the abolition of all monopolies and restrictions, though, as experience has proved, they might ascribe their subsequent distress to the removal of those restrictions. They would require pledges which it would be impossible to give, and what would happen? Those candidates would be preferred who would give the greatest promise of indiscriminate abolition. And here, my Lords, I wish to be understood, not to give any opinion as to the continuance of these monopolies, but simply to express my belief that, in Parliament, as constituted at present, information and evidence would influence decision, but that, in a Reformed Parliament, these cases would be prejudged. My Lords, as to another difficulty, it will not be very easy, especially if any individual Minister should have become unpopular, to procure the return of Ministers to Parliament. Perhaps (as nothing is impossible now) it may be in contemplation to adopt the French system, and to allow the Minister to support his measures in the House of Commons, but not to vote unless he be a Member. And, as some persons have thought that the Peerage might be held *ex officio*, and with the office resignable or resumable by the Crown, perhaps we may have the honour of seeing some of those individuals take their seats in your Lordships' House. But, my Lords, it has often been assumed, and not so often contradicted as it ought to have been, that the Representatives of close boroughs are invariably the tools of the Ministry. Now, my Lords, this is notoriously not the fact, and we have seen several instances in which public men have been rejected by the constituents both of counties and towns on account of their political principles who have not disdained to re-enter the House of Parliament by the "narrow portal," as I think it was called, of a close borough, and have these re-asserted these opinions which they honestly entertained—opinions which had been objectionable to their constituents, not because they were slavish and submissive to the Crown, but because they were too licentious in the cause of liberty itself. My Lords, if there be no limited constituencies, what is a public man to do? Is he either to deceive his constituents or to retract his opinions? My Lords, there is another course which I am afraid he will be likely to pursue, he will follow the impulsion given him by public clamour, which, on many occasions, would not be the public opinion. And, My Lords, in my fancy, I could conceive a public man of splendid talents, who, in his early youth, had formed plans of the most extensive Reform, which, in his maturer age, he had thought it wise to correct as unsafe or impracticable, who afterwards might be called to the councils of his sovereign, and then urged by the voice of the people, which would be echoed by such Representatives as this Bill will give, goaded by a licentious but powerful Press, he might be driven forward in a course of wild innovation with a celerity the least proportioned to his opinions, or his wishes. Perhaps, too, at the close of his public life, he would experience regrets not the less painful because studiously concealed, that his ambition had been gratified, but that he had sacrificed the public weal to a transient popularity, and that the impartial historian would not associate his name with the growing glory and prosperity of his country, but rather ascribe to him, and to the measures which he had proposed the beginning of her decadence. Under the present Constitution of Parliament, in that predicament, no man, except voluntarily, can be placed. For, my Lords, whatever may be the difference of opinions on political subjects, or our feelings of party, that Minister could have recourse to a great portion of the House of Commons, and to a majority of this House who, forgetting all party differences, would support him in a resistance to measures tending to that very anarchy which, according to the statement of their supporters, must be the inevitable consequence of their rejection. My Lords, I have hitherto spoken of this Bill as calculated to render the House of Commons more democratical; but this is doubtful; and out of this House it has been offered to us as a consolation to diminish our opposition to it, that under its operation that House will be more aristocratic. I certainly shall not go into the details of this Bill, neither do I profess to understand the rules which have been laid down, and which appear to be not, as in other cases, rules by which an arrangement is to be governed, but as points from which to take a departure, according to the inclination of the authors of the scheme. And when it is seen that, in the Bill which is extending franchise, the number of electors in some towns will be diminished, a suspicion arises that, though close boroughs are to be abolished, something analogous is to be substituted, and that both in town and in the division of counties, individuals will obtain an influence equivalent to nomination, with this difference, that, as it is hoped the influence will be transferred from the opponents to the supporters of his Majesty's Ministers; and I think that the admissions of some persons high in office have confirmed that suspicion, that, in the instance of Whitehaven, the rules of the Bill had been departed from, in order to neutralize the influence of Tory Peers in the neighbourhood. Nor will it be removed by the declaration of the noble Marquis (the Marquis of Cleveland) that though he voted for the disfranchisement of close boroughs, he had the wish—I do not think he said the hope—that he might retain his parliamentary influence. Lastly, as to the question which is constantly proposed to us wherever we go, and which is the theme of general conversation—if the Lords reject this Bill, what is to follow? My Lords, I would state with great submission, that it appears to me that you have only to examine the Bill before you, and if it be objectionable, reject it. I cannot think that any apprehension of danger can justify a dereliction of duty. That rejection cannot be accompanied, in my humble opinion—ought not to be followed—by any declaration of your readiness to agree to a plan of moderate Reform: to these words no definite meaning is attached. Such declarations and pledges on the part of individuals are inconvenient, in public assemblies they are dangerous, because they are liable to misinterpretation. What, then, my Lords, would follow? I attach but little importance to those threats which have been so plentifully held out by the Press, in language most gross, libellous towards individuals, but libellous—worse than libellous, almost treasonable—towards the Sovereign, and libellous towards the whole body of your Lordships, whose constitution and existence has been threatened with destructions: libels they are, indeed, of the grossest description—but although brought under the notice of his Majesty's Attorney General, they have had the good fortune to escape his censure, except when his fiscal sensibilities were awakened by an evasion of the Stamp duty. If the present Bill were rejected, disturbances there might be—a resistance even to the payment of taxes; I know not to what excesses the follies and vices of men might lead them. In the metropolis, violence of an inferior description, the demolition of windows (which I cannot think are better protected than they were last year, now that it is known that the proprietors cannot obtain any relief from the hundred). These are trifles compared with insurrections breaking out in different parts of the country; but, my Lords, I have but one opinion as to insurrections in this, or any other country—they would never have any permanent success, if the Government would do its duty. Now, my Lords, when some of these dangers were anticipated in the last Session, I expressed a confidence in his Majesty's Ministers, which, I am sorry to say, is much impaired. However, I should hope that the lamentable outrages which have taken place at Bristol and Nottingham will have opened their eyes, and that they will see that it is not enough to express a hope that the laws will be obeyed, when persons, certainly not their accredited agents, but their supporters, and admirers of Reform, instigate the people to fury, and (contrary to all sense and reason, I will admit) persuade them that acts of violence, though they cannot be abetted by the King and his Ministers, will yet be viewed with lenity. It may appear extraordinary that so gross a delusion should have prevailed, but I speak in the presence of many noble Lords whose local knowledge must have convinced them of the fact. It is a delusion propagated by political associations, which the Ministers know to be illegal, and with the dangerous character of which they have been made acquainted by a communication from a quarter (the Duke of Wellington) from which such an act of patriotism was to be expected, and which, I hope, will be an example to all persons in opposition. The question of Reform stands now on particular grounds. It is not only urged on your Lordships by the voice of the people, but by two decisions of the House of Commons; and it was also recommended to your consideration in a Speech from the Throne, which, as I before stated, is, constitutionally speaking, the Speech of his Majesty's Ministers, though there can be no doubt that an impression has been made on the public mind that that Speech expresses the sentiments of the highest personage in the State, though I am perfectly prepared to do my duty in giving my vote for the rejection of the present measure, I cannot deceive myself by supposing that that rejection will be a settlement of the question. The people, some of whom are favourable to this Bill, others inclined to a moderate Reform, and many who see the injury which has been inflicted on commerce and trade, deeply deplore the agitation of this question ; all concur in one opinion that it cannot be settled except by a legislative enactment. I should be happy to think that a legislative enactment of the nature of the Bill now before the House would settle the question, but I feel convinced, from the arbitrary mode in which the Bill abrogates all constitutional and prescriptive rights, and creates others, that the agitation of the question of Reform will not cease on the passing of the present measure. I agree with those who think it most desirable that the question should be settled; but it cannot be settled by the passing of a Bill which will lead to endless disputes. The settlement of the question can only be brought about by a measure which will satisfy the people. What that measure shall be it is impossible for me to attempt to say; neither does it appear to me to be the duty of your Lordships to propose any ; we have only to consider the present Bill. By that Bill, or one of equal efficiency, his Majesty's Ministers have declared that they will stand or fall; and if they abide by that declaration, thy must be answerable for the consequences in which not only they themselves, but we, shall be involved. But, if after this Bill shall have been rejected (as I trust it will be), they will wisely, not weakly, not dishonourably, profit by the delay thus afforded them, and, in another Session bring forward a more moderate measure, or as the extensive scheme they have in contemplation involves the actual revision of the articles which bind Scotland and Ireland to England, if they will follow the example of those Ministers who brought about the Union with Scotland, and advise the Crown to appoint a Commission, to which it might be referred, to report what changes could be safely introduced, with a due regard to all the interests of the three component parts of the British empire—then, my Lords, I should entertain the hope that some measure, divested of those objections which have twice caused the rejection of the Reform Bill by this House, might be proposed. But, my Lords, if any measure equally efficient, or, as I should say, equally unjust, were again presented to your Lordships, I trust that you will never allow the rights of the meanest individual in this country, of which you are the guardians and protectors, to be thus arbitrarily torn away from them. For if you do, depend upon it, my Lords, that, at no great distance of time, your own rights will be the object of aggression, and you will become the unpitied victims of that system of spoliation which you will yourselves have sanctioned.

Lord *Colville* rejoiced that his noble friend (the Earl of Limerick) had undertaken the task of showing the fallacy of the remarks of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shrewsbury), who preceded with regard to the situation of Ireland as connected with this country. He had always dreaded that Catholic Emancipation would produce such fruits as they had seen a small display of in the course of the debate, and he had therefore, opposed it. But they had now again before them a measure which was consequent upon agitation, although it was brought forward under the specious name of Reform. This was the second Bill introduced by that name, which would be equally as mischievous and dangerous as the former, to the institutions under which this country had so long flourished. He owed it to himself, and to the noble body who had returned him as one of their Representatives to that House in five successive Parliaments to speak his sentiments distinctly on so important a subject, deeply as he lamented his inability to convey them in language so forcible as to make any impression, particularly after the speeches of the noble Baron (Ellenborough), and that of his noble friend (the Earl of Mansfield), who had just sat down, nor could he refrain from tendering his humble thanks to those two noble Lords who had so ably expressed sentiments, in most of which he fully participated though he was unable to give them utterance, in a manner worthy of notice, after them. He was free to say in plain terms, however, that he regarded the Bill with the most unqualified disapprobation; and if the Motion before the House should proceed to a division, he should feel bound to give his vote against it. He had voted against the last Bill conscientiously, but not without regret, and had hoped that the next measure brought forward by Ministers would have been of a less objectionable character than the last. But the present Bill he considered to be as bad, if not worse than the former. He fully adopted and cherished the opinions of his late lamented friend Mr. Canning, on this subject, and he would beg leave to read a part of one of his speeches as the foundation on which his present opposition rested. The right hon. Gentleman had been eulogizing the great and successful efforts made by this country during the late war, and added—'Amidst 'the devastations alike of all that was 'most stately, and all that was most 'humble, one edifice alone stood firm and 'erect, affording at once a refuge to the 'fallen, and a succour to those who stood. 'Well! was that unassailable bulwark distinguished for its superior size and di- 'mensions by the greater number of its 'garrison, or by its position? Certainly 'not. In all these, many which had 'fallen were greatly superior—but it was 'a fortress so happily put together, so 'strongly connected in all its parts—so 'wonderfully combining all the means 'of internal security and external defence, 'that its gallant garrison was able to defy 'the power which had laid waste the civil- 'ized world. That fortress was our coun- 'try, and the secret of all its strength and 'greatness—the sacred cement which binds 'together that impregnable work—is the 'British Constitution. To that Constitution 'the people of England are, I trust, all 'equally attached and devoted, however, as 'freemen, we may sometimes honestly differ 'on the best mode of practically applying 'it in the detailed administration of public 'concerns. But after it has withstood so 'many storms—after it has enabled us to 'overcome so many dangers and diffi- 'culties from within — and to repel 'so many assaults from without—I can- 'not believe that a sober and reflect- 'ing people will easily be seduced to at- 'tempt any great and undefined change 'in the structure of the fabric itself. 'When men deal in loose and general de- 'clamation on such a subject—when they 'glibly talk of the most difficult and fear- 'ful question which human ingenuity can 'conceive, and the most intricate which 'human wisdom can investigate—the 'formation of a new, or the remodelling 'of the old Constitution in any country, 'as of a plain self-evident proposition, I 'own that I feel very little respect for their 'understanding; or, if I am compelled 'to acknowledge their intelligence, I can 'only do so at the price of assuming '(what I fear is too often the case) that 'they themselves have very little re- 'spect for the understandings of those to 'whom they addressed such observations. 'Least of all would they be applicable to 'our own Constitution, the work of the ac- 'cumulated experience of ages, favoured 'by choice and circumstances, and pro- 'gressively improved and matured by the 'cautious wisdom of all the great legis- 'lators and statesmen who have served and 'adorned this happy country.' He never could give his consent to the Bill as it stood at present, and as he was hopeless of any amendments being adopted in Committee which would render it unobjectionable in his judgment, he thought that the best course he could take was, to say "not-content" to the second reading.

The Earl of *Harrowby* said, that no man could be more sensible than he was of the disadvantages under which he then rose to address their Lordships at that period of the debate, while the voice of a noble Earl (Mansfield) must be still almost sounding in their ears—conveying to their Lordships at once the ablest arguments, combined with the brightest specimens of eloquence, which it had been for some time his fortune to have heard.

There were many parts of the noble Earl's speech in which he fully concurred, and many parts in which he did not concur; but he should not attempt to answer the noble Earl further than to say, that that which they chiefly differed upon was the existence of boroughs of a certain description, and the principle of disfranchisement. The noble Earl had an insurmountable objection to all disfranchisement, and differed from him also in conceiving that their Lordships might, without any disastrous consequences, again refuse to read the Reform Bill a second time. The noble Earl had taunted him with having changed his opinions on the present measure, and, in doing so, was only adding the sanction of his name to taunts and insinuations dealt in elsewhere. He did not expect this from the noble Earl, because he had flattered himself that he had guarded himself against the possibility of misrepresentation, when explaining, a few evenings back, the grounds on which he should feel it to be his duty to give a vote on the present occasion different from that given by him when the Bill was formerly before their Lordships. But that had not turned out to be the case; for he had been called upon, not, he presumed, to answer the defenders of the measure, or the opponents of the measure, but to answer himself. His only hope, he would confess, in addressing their Lordships on the present occasion, was, that he should be able to persuade them of the honesty of his intention, and that he was still animated by the same object as when he was last addressing them, although it was true that he was pursuing the end by different means. He was not ignorant of the obloquy which his course was sure to call upon him; knowing full well, that, in times of excitement like the present, be the course pursued what it would, it was certain to call down the censure of those who followed an opposite one; and, above all, knowing full well, that those who, like himself, were pursuing a middle course between two antagonist parties, were sure to win the angry reprobation of both. He expected that such would be his fate, and he was not deceived. He had been attacked by both sides of the House: he had been denounced as a "deserter" to his party, and a "treacherous friend." He had, nevertheless, sat silent, but would now say briefly, in answer to this last ungracious accusation, that it struck him that, as no man could be with justice arraigned as a deserter to a party in which he had never enlisted himself, or arraigned as a treacherous friend, where he had never pledged friendship; so neither accusation could, with justice, be applied to him, who had not enlisted himself, nor pledged himself to any party, or particular line of policy whatever. His speech against the Bill, when it was, on a former occasion, under their consideration, had been quoted against his proposed line of proceeding on the present occasion, by the noble Earl to-night, and a noble Marquis on a former evening, principally with a view to show that he was then endeavouring to effect what he had formerly declared was an impossibility,—namely, effect such alterations in the provisions of the Bill as would render it unprejudicial to existing institutions, without at the same time destroying its essential principles. Now, without arguing the question whether possibility or impossibility in politics was not a relative term contingent altogether on circumstances, he would ask any man who had heard his speech, and had taken the trouble of noticing the views which he then took of its subject matter, if that speech was the speech of a man determined to resist, under all circumstances whatever, the consideration of a measure of Parliamentary Reform? He denied that it could be so interpreted; at least, if it could, he would say, that never did words more misrepresent the sentiments they were intended to convey, for never was any thought further from his mind than an unqualified resistance to all Reform. Indeed, the thought or opinion which more than another he was anxious to express was, that they should never again treat the present Bill as they had treated the last. "I wished," continued the noble Earl, "to impress upon your Lordships' minds, that though we had then acted rightly in rejecting the Bill, we should not be warranted to do so again. This will do once, but must not be repeated. We cannot hope to again successfully resist a measure which the House of Commons has sanctioned for a second time by a large majority, and in favour of which the people of England had expressed a decided opinion. It was because I felt this, that I had prepared a resolution of which many noble Lords are aware as well as of the reasons which induced me not to bring it forward, by which the

House would pledge itself, in the then next session, to take into its serious consideration some plan for extending the franchise to his Majesty's subjects, and for correcting the abuses which had crept into the representative branch of the Constitution." He was on the point of moving this Resolution, when he was persuaded by some noble friends, that to do so then would cause more harm than good—that it would be better to wait till the excitement of the public mind had been somewhat allayed, before a more moderate measure of Reform than that brought forward by Ministers should be submitted to Parliament. He yielded to the suggestion, hoping that the interval between the two sessions would afford the public and their Lordships time to maturely consider the real merits of the question, and that the result would be, that both would see, that the plan of Ministers, if adopted, would prove injurious to all existing interests. He regretted to say, that he had been disappointed in his expectations, and that the delay had not produced the beneficial effects which he had hoped for. There was sufficient time for a reaction in the public mind with respect to the Ministerial Bill to have taken place, but it could not be denied, that, though strong as had been the objections urged in that House and elsewhere against that Bill, no such reaction had taken place. He still thought, however, that the delay had produced much good. It must not be supposed from this, as a noble Lord had wrongly insinuated, that he thought that the changes which had been effected in the Bill, in consequence of that delay, had entirely, to his mind, removed all the objections which he had expressed against the former measure. By no means; though many of his objections had been removed, many remained, which he should ever feel to be insurmountable, so far as the principles of the Bill were concerned. But still, he repeated, the delay had produced good, and had produced great and most important changes in the minds of the opponents, as well as the advocates of Reform. When the Bill was formerly under their consideration, there were, to all practical purposes, two parties in the State with respect to Parliamentary Reform—those who went the lengths of Ministers, and those who objected to every measure implying extensive alterations in the existing system. Since that time the second party had disappeared, and the country was divided into those who insisted upon a sweeping measure, and those who were not repugnant to the passing of a moderate one. Then the temper of the two parties had experienced an equally extensive change —on the one hand leading to a diminution of the dangers of rejecting the Bill—on the other hand seriously aggravating them. On a former occasion he had stated that there was danger in their either rejecting or adopting the scheme of Ministers. He repeated the declaration then—with this addition, that it appeared to him that after the changes which had been effected in the Bill, and after the important fact that its main principles had been twice adopted by the House of Commons with increased majorities, it would then be safer to let the Bill go into Committee, than, as on the former occasion, refuse to consider it in its present form. It was not enough for noble Lords to point out the obvious dangers of passing the Bill—and of their magnitude, no man could be more sensible than he was—unless they, at the same time, were prepared to show that the opposite danger of rejecting it was of far less moment. And this task no noble Lord had as yet ventured to perform. When he stated that the opinions of those out of doors who had hitherto been totally opposed to a measure like the present, had changed very much within the last twelve months, he stated what the facts daily occurring before their eyes more than confirmed. Where, he would ask, were the petitions against all Reform? Some noble Lords had presented what were called petitions "against the Bill," and even these were few and far between; but did any of them protest against any change in our representative system? on the contrary, did they not all demand a "prompt and vigorous correction of the abuses" which had been allowed too long to impede the working of the Constitution? Even in the petition presented a few evenings since by a noble Duke (the Duke of Rutland) from Leicester against the Bill, and which the noble Duke had designated to be an Anti-reform petition, but which he (Lord Harrowby) would call a petition for moderate Reform, the prayer was, that their Lordships might not "ultimately pass a measure dangerous to the Constitution." The feeling of the country being thus undeniably in favour of some change in our representative system, it was the duty of their Lordships to conciliate that feeling, so far as was compatible with the true interests of the country. It was on this consideration he would vote for the second reading, hoping, as he had more than once stated, that in Committee he should be able to effect such alterations in detail as would, in some degree, obviate the objections which he still entertained against the principles of the Bill. But it had been held out as a threat, that if he thus voted for the second reading, he was bound to go the full length of the general principle which his vote sanctioned. Before he answered this assertion, he would first remind their Lordships that all, both in and out of doors, were now advocates for some measure of Reform; so that the only question was, the kind and amount of that Reform, and whether the general principles of the measure then under consideration, were those most calculated to satisfy the wants of the country? The question he again and again repeated was, then, one wholly of degree; and so considered, it would be seen that the scheme promised them by the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) was as inconsistent with itself, as it was obnoxious to most of the objections urged against the Bill it was meant to supersede. What were the principles of that Bill? Simply disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and the extension of the franchise. What were the principles of the noble Duke's plan? Enfranchisement, disfranchisement [the Duke of *Buckingham: "No"*] and the extension of the franchise. The noble Duke said, he did not mean to disfranchise; but what, he would ask, was the consolidating of five boroughs into one, but a disfranchisement of from ten to two Members? And this reminded him of a striking inconsistency in this part of the noble Duke's project. The noble Duke would fain preserve a portion of the nomination boroughs, on the ground that they served as inlets to Parliament for men of great capacity, who otherwise could not obtain an entrance there. And how did the noble Duke propose to preserve this nomination influence? Why, by distributing the power of the nomination, which was at present in the hands of one proprietor, among five or six proprietors—rather a strange mode of guarding against those collisions and contrarieties of interests which had been charged against the present Bill. There were five boroughs, say in Cornwall, the property of different individuals, and these the noble Duke would "consolidate" into one returning two Members, in order to preserve in degree the power of nomination. Was there ever a more absurd proposition? And did noble Lords deceive themselves that such crude and contradictory schemes would satisfy public opinion, now admitted on all hands to be irresistible? No: far wiser would it be to reject the principle of Reform altogether, than thus attempt to impose upon themselves and the public, by nominally admitting, but virtually scouting it. But to return to the proposition, whether he who voted for the second reading of the Bill, was bound to maintain its provisions in Committee. He had heard the speech of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) yesterday evening with much satisfaction, for he saw in its moderate and conciliatory tone, a disposition, as he thought, to adopt—at least not pertinaciously to resist—such amendments as would not necessarily destroy its more important features, and he saw in it that deep conviction; in which he was confident their Lordships all participated, of the necessity of a prompt settlement of the question for the peace of the country. This temper of the noble Earl's speech, as well as that change in the temper of the times to which he had before referred, emboldened him to say, that though they could not hope to deprive the Bill of all its evil tendencies, they might yet hope, in Committee, to suggest such alterations as would prevent much evil. But then they were told that they should not yield to clamour or intimidation—that they owed it to themselves and the country to be above the "eloquence of fear." He agreed that they ought not—he was sure that they would not yield to intimidation—but he was also sure that they would not be induced by vapid declamation, to confound a timely yielding to the force of circumstances which was above their control, with a cowardly shrinking to clamour. If their Lordships saw that they could not hope to obtain good Government till the question of Reform was settled, was it not their obvious duty—no matter how they might differ as to the particular mode of Reform—to assist in effecting that settlement as promptly and satisfactorily as possible? And if they also saw that nothing less than an extensive measure of Reform would satisfy the public mind, were they not bound to forego their own predilections, and do the best to prevent the ill consequences of a too rapid and violent change? It would not do to say —"All very well, but we persuade ourselves we are promoting the best and lasting interests of the Reformers themselves, by stinting them in their demands;" for, as he had said on a former occasion, it was not enough that a Government was intrinsically good, unless the people governed at the same time felt and acknowledged it to be so. Every free Government must ultimately rest upon ~~the basis~~ of public opinion; when the wind from that quarter was foul, if it was only a light and variable breeze, their Lordships might tack or cast anchor; but when the public feeling assumed the strength and steadiness of a trade wind it was in vain to struggle against the gale. There were many occasions, he admitted, when it would be better to defer the final settlement of a question till the occasion which had called it forth had changed or passed away; but he would ask, was the present question of Reform one which any delay could get rid of, or, what was more, any Government prevent? If the people, indeed, formed erroneous opinions relating to subjects upon which they called the Legislature to proceed to enactments, then, undoubtedly, it was the duty of Government to oppose them, and wait until those notions had been corrected; but it was absurd to believe that the people were anxious for civil war, or for rebellion. Their feeling in favour of Reform, was not a mere violent ebullition of transient fury, but a chronic and deep-seated affection, which the rankling of suspense and disappointment, and the "hope deferred that maketh the heart sick," served but to exacerbate. There were doubtlessly combustible materials collected, to which a spark applied might set the whole in a flame. There was a belief of the want of a co-operation on the part of Government with the people—a want of confidence in the institutions under which we lived. There was a want of respect for that Parliament which had twice, by a large majority, passed the Bill, and which had been twice denounced from the Throne as not being the Representatives of the people of the country. Were these facts, or were they not? Had not the House of Commons twice, by an increasing and large majority, shown that that House did not adequately represent the people. And if so, was it for their Lordships to turn round and gainsay a decision thus solemnly pronounced and repeated? Let not their Lordships suppose, that in using this plain language, he did not entertain his original objections to the Bill. He still thought that Ministers were much to blame in launching a measure of such sweeping change—a measure which, he had formerly stated, being once launched, it was equally dangerous to reject or to adopt; he still thought the people of England were wrong as to their opinions of the benefits which they possibly could derive from that measure; and he thought the House of Commons still more wrong in twice adopting its provisions. He also retained his conviction that the day on which the King on his Throne had promulgated the plan of that measure was a day fatal to its integrity—perhaps existence—a day only less fatal than that on which, for the second time, his Majesty was advised to call the attention of his Parliament to the necessity of speedily adopting it. But though he held these opinions, he felt that the question stood now, unfortunately, on far other grounds. It was now not a question between this or that plan of Reform, but one wholly of a choice of evils. This at least was the view he took of it, and which, in justice to himself, he felt bound to explain, as the ground on which he felt himself compelled, in this choice of evils—that is, the choice between the dangers of rejecting and adopting the Bill—to vote for the adoption, as the lesser evil. But supposing he was wrong, and that their Lordships should again reject the Bill, he would ask, was it safe to risk the hazards of a third Bill? Had they heard anything from the noble Earl (Earl Grey) which could induce them to believe that he would consent to a measure of less efficiency or extent? Were they sure that another measure would not most probably be one of still more extensive changes, and one brought forward under still more objectionable auspices? If their Lordships rejected the present Motion for a second reading of the Bill, would they not be provoking that evil to which the noble Earl said, he would not have recourse but as the last resort. But let them proceed a step further. Let them suppose the Bill rejected, and that a new Government had succeeded to that of the noble Earl. Were the opponents of the present Bill foolish enough to believe that they would gain anything by that change?

Did they suppose that by a change of men, they could get rid of the Reform Question altogether? He would tell them not to deceive themselves for one moment by such a dangerous belief. Let his Majesty select whom he might for his counsels, Reform must constitute a condition of office, if those persons hoped to continue a single week in his service. He said a single week, for even less would suffice for the present House of Commons to disabuse any Minister who should be mad enough to assume the helm on the principles of anti-Reform. But perhaps he might be told "the remedy was obvious—let his Majesty dissolve Parliament, and so procure a House of Commons more amenable to his new Counsellors." He would ask, where was the man bold enough—he would say, mad enough—to make the trial? Apart from all the evil consequences of protracted suspense, and delay, and excitement, he would ask, was there the remotest chance of their obtaining a House of Commons less pledged to Reform than the present? Was it not probable, indeed certain, that the new House of Commons would insist upon a measure of far more extensive change than even the present, he admitted, objectionable measure? And was it not equally certain that their Lordships' means of resisting its adoption would be considerably lessened? He would, then, in this choice of evils, call upon them to adopt the less, and vote with him for the second reading. The question, he repeated, over and over again, was one of comparative danger; let them not blindly follow the most dangerous course of proceeding. But it had been said by the noble Lord (Lord Ellenborough), that we ought, notwithstanding everything we saw, still to give a persevering resistance to Reform. He, however, did not know how this was to be done, and willing as he might be to do it, he still could not serve in any army, if one wing of it was commanded by the High Bailiff of Old Sarum, and the other was to be under the command of the Mayor of Gatton. He would again intreat their Lordships to allow the Bill to go into Committee: he would entreat them to bend their minds in Committee to remove the objectionable parts, and great amendments might be made in the measure, without rendering it unpalatable to the other House of Parliament. He would intreat their Lordships to make all such amendments as they thought unpalatable with the great principle stated in the preamble, taking care that the commercial and manufacturing interests were properly represented, without, at the same time, neglecting the interests of the agricultural portion of the community. He hoped that a proper balance would be preserved. He did not here speak of that balance of these interests as though they were opposed to each other, for he concurred with what the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had asserted, that their interests were united. He wished no preponderating influence to be extended to either. He should, however, always object to a democratic power extending itself, converting the House of Commons into a body of delegates. The question now came to this, were the people to be disregarded? All experience had shown that wise Governments had attended to the demands of the people, where those demands were grounded on rational foundations. He had but few words to add, and they related to himself, for which he begged to apologize for troubling their Lordships upon such a topic. He felt, in the discharge of this most important duty, that he acted conscientiously, and to the best of his belief. He had lately taken but little part in debates and political affairs, and if it were the final vote which he should ever give, he felt reason to be satisfied with it. In that vote he had been biassed by no one—he had no political object in view—for no consideration on earth should ever induce him to take any political situation again; it was, therefore, without hope or fear that he came to the conclusion he had; he was anxious to retire to the bosom of his family in private life—having witnessed one friend after another quitting this mortal scene, whom he loved, and whose memory he revered. He was not unaware of the obloquy which might, and probably would, attach to him from quarters that would give him pain, on account of the course he had taken; but it appeared to his judgment that he was acting rightly, and he felt bound to sacrifice the applause he might have received had he taken another course. Applause had never been the object of his ambition, nor should he now shrink from the censure that would attend him. He was anxious to retire into private life; and, if it should be his last vote, he felt gratified that he raised his feeble voice in favour of the second reading of the Bill.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, he should commence his observations by expressing the deep concern and pain he felt in offering himself to their Lordships on the present occasion, when he had to express a different opinion from that of his noble friend who had just sat down. After having served confidentially for many years in a Government in which his noble friend had been a principal Minister—after having subsequently sat in the Council with him for five years—when he was called upon last October to consider this question, having had the satisfaction to follow his noble friend's lead and counsel in the vote which their Lordships had then agreed to, he certainly felt no common regret at being compelled to differ from his noble friend on this occasion. Their Lordships might conceive, knowing as they did the satisfaction with which he formerly heard his noble friend's speech, the pain with which he felt himself bound to advert to that speech, and to compare it with what had fallen this night from his noble friend, and which he must do, in order to obviate the mischief that might befall from their Lordships feeling the same confidence in his noble friend now that they had justly reposed in him last year. He was sure, however, that his noble friend would not feel that he was wanting in personal respect, although he felt compelled to pursue this course. On that occasion, the noble Earl had stated, that the question was, to show, whether they approved of the principle of the Bill by voting for the second reading; and the noble Earl then voted against the second reading, because he did not approve of the principle. The noble Earl had then said, 'The principle 'and object of the Bill, are to make the 'Constitution more democratical. Look 'to the consequences. When that assembly, which has already become the 'chief governing power of the State, 'attains to be not only the governing 'power, but the Government itself, and 'suffers itself to be guided by other assemblies of another description, such as have 'recently been formed in the North, and 'especially at Birmingham—when these 'come with their directions for our conduct 'thundering over our heads; what, I ask, 'will be the kind of government then presiding over the interests of the country? 'What is it that we are to expect from a 'Legislative Assembly so constituted and 'so directed?'* The noble Earl after addressing their Lordships in a speech of upwards of two hours duration, which was listened to with the greatest delight, and every word of which proved the soundness of his doctrines, came at last to the conclusion—'We are told by the noble Earl, 'that we have no option but to take this 'Bill as it is—to adopt at once a proposition which is to consign us and our posterity to a new form of Government, 'which no one has ever ventured to tell 'us would be practicable, and which, if it 'were practicable, would, in my opinion, 'be pernicious.'† These were the sentiments of the noble Earl with respect to a Bill, than which the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey), told them the present measure was no less effective, and which indeed they all knew to be the same Bill, and one also, which, if the noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby) was to be believed, could produce no beneficial effects. Then he would ask the noble Earl how could he say that we must read this Bill a second time and go into Committee in order to adopt such a Bill? And what were the grounds that he assigned for this new course? The first was, that this Bill had been sent a second time up from the House of Commons, and had passed there by an increasing majority. Now, he (the Duke of Wellington) must advert again to what had been said—he believed by the noble Earl—but certainly by the noble Lord at the Table (Lord Wharncliffe)—as to the effect this would have on the constitution of the House of Commons. That noble Baron had, in March 1831, foretold to the Government what would be the effects of a general election—namely, that it must cause the return to the House of Commons, not of Members, but of delegates, and that its result would be to place the House of Lords in the situation in which it stood last year, and was now again placed on the present occasion. Was everything then to be given up because the noble Lord opposite had taken that course? Was that House to be destroyed, or must it lend its aid to destroy the Constitution because Ministers chose to persevere? The only remedy for this would be to place things as they were before the agitation was commenced, to restore calmness before deliberating, and their Lordships ought rather to address the King to remove the Ministers from their places, and put things as they were before, in order that the House might have a fair opportunity for discussion, than proceed at present to read that Bill a second time. He would ask, was the country to be handed over to a Government which was not in any manner practicable? Was the security of all the institutions of the country to be brought to risk, because the House of Commons was in a state which prevented it from giving to this Bill a deliberate consideration? All the arguments regarding the decisions of the House of Commons must come to the same end. There would, no doubt, be ten decisions of the same kind, if it were left to the same House, because that House was pledged and returned for the purpose. But the country was not to be abandoned on this account. He altogether denied that the difficulty now experienced was chronic, as had been stated by the noble Earl; it was only temporary, and was to be removed by the Government that had raised it. Then the next point of the noble Earl was the opinion of the country. Now, there could be no doubt whatsoever that there was no opinion existing in the country, in the year 1829, and the beginning of 1830, on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. [*Cheers.*] That was a fact which was fully admitted, notwithstanding the cheers of noble Lords, and he would say it might be taken for granted. Then came the French Revolution, and the insurrection in Belgium, which occurred at the commencement of the elections of 1830; and there was no doubt that these events occasioned a very great excitement and alteration in the elections, as well as greatly inflamed the people with respect to Parliamentary Reform. The noble Lords opposite had then come into power, and (the Duke of Wellington) would say, that that Parliament was ready to pass a measure of moderate Parliamentary Reform. But the noble Lords opposite had thought proper, instead of carrying such a measure, to dissolve that Parliament, and a new Parliament was called under a degree of excitement in the public mind such as had never before been witnessed. The consequence was, that the excitement had continued ever since, and it had been kept up by the strong opinion put forward and entertained, that it was the King who wished for Parliamentary Reform in the manner proposed by this Bill. He believed it was no such thing. His opinion was, that the King followed the advice of his servants, but he believed that it was the idea thus engendered that the King wished for Reform which rendered it difficult that there should not be some Reform. It was not, however, to be supposed, that the King took any interest in the subject. He had no doubt that when this opinion reached the country, they would think like him; and he entertained no doubt, whatever, that if it were supposed that the King's mind was altered, the noble Earl opposite would not be able to pass this Bill. Indeed, he was sure from experience, that, if the nation, on any great constitutional question were not convinced that the King would go through with the Ministers, it would be impossible for any set of Ministers to carry any such measure. He would also wish noble Lords to attend particularly to this. The opinion of the gentlemen of the country—he spoke from knowledge with respect to the southern counties, and from sure report as to other counties generally—but he did say, that the opinion of the gentlemen of the landed property, and of the learning of the country was against this Bill. The Bill was, on the other hand, supported by the noble Lords opposite, and by their adherents, certainly not a numerous class; it was also supported by all the dissenters from the Church of England, and by all who wished it should pass, as a means of their attaining votes; but he would repeat, that it was, in fact, opposed to the sentiments of all the gentlemen, of the yeomanry, and of the middling classes throughout the country. Yes, he would say, there was a change of opinion, and that the best part of the public were not desirous of the Bill, but were, on the contrary, apprehensive of its effects. But they did not hear of this, and why? Because no gentleman in the country could go to a public meeting and speak his sentiments secure from the attacks of the mobs. Another ground on which the noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby) said that they ought to read the Bill a second time was, that they should endeavour to amend it; but if the noble Earl found that would be difficult last year, would it not be more difficult now? He had that morning had a note put into his hand of the anomalies of the Bill, which was the result of a paper laid before the House of Commons even since the passing of the Bill, and its being sent up to this House and a persual of it would show that there was nothing they could do which would improve this Bill, and weed it of the gross errors with which it abounded. By Parliamentary Paper 232, being an abstract of the practical operation of the Bill, according to the new limits given to the several boroughs, it appeared that the borough of Clitheroe, which was partially disfranchised in schedule B, had a greater population than sixty places which were left untouched; another, Shaftesbury, than fifty-two; another, Wilton, than forty-six. Clitheroe had more houses than fifty-seven untouched boroughs; Wilton than fifty-six; Shaftesbury than fifty-four; and so on as to taxes. Christchurch, which was in schedule B, paid more assessed taxes than forty-five places not in the schedule, whereof no less than nine were new-made boroughs; Wilton paid more than thirty-nine; Droitwich and Wallingford more than thirty-three, and so on, seven or eight other places being put into schedule B, which have larger constituencies than boroughs which were untouched. The reason that the difference in this class was not so great as in the population and houses was, that the arbitrary additions made to the boroughs were mostly of poor and scattered districts which did not add to the taxation in the same proportion. But the most important view of all was the number of 10*l.* houses, the amount of the future constituency. Would it be credited that Hythe, partially disfranchised, would have more electors than fifty-five places not in schedule B, of which three were new creations; Morpeth than thirty-seven; Dartmouth than thirty-four; Wallingford than thirty-two, and so on. And Knaresborough and Tavistock were kept untouched, while seven or eight other boroughs, having a greater constituency, were placed in schedule B. Let their Lordships compare Christchurch and Tavistock as their respective merits were set forth in the paper which he would read to them. The noble Duke then quoted the following document:—

---

* See Hansard, Third Series, vol. vii. p. 1153.

† Ibid. p. 1174.

	Tavistock.	Christchurch.	Difference.
Population	5,602	6,087	485
Houses	821	1,354	553
10*l.* ditto	380	400	20
Taxes	1,283	2,066	783

	10 Boroughs in Schedule B, sending 10 Members.	10 Boroughs which are to send 20 Members.
10*l.* Houses	4,084	2,944
Population	71,196	42,666

From this it would appear that the difference was nearly two to one in favour of the boroughs not sending Members. This document had been laid on the Table since the Bill had passed the House of Commons, and their Lordships might be told, and, indeed, he was at that moment told, it was an argument why they should go into Committee. [*Cheers.*] Before his noble friend (Lord Wharncliffe) rejoiced in his cheer, let him (the Duke of Wellington) remind his noble friend of what he had said last year. It was this—"Many persons had voted for the second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons, in hopes of amending it afterwards in Committee; but every person who had the slightest experience in Parliament well knew, that when a bill, brought in by the Government, was read a second time, it was a matter of extreme difficulty to make any alterations in it in Committee."* His noble friend's parliamentary experience reached to the House of Commons as well as to that House. His noble friend knew the difficulty even in the other House, and he believed there was no instance of any extensive alterations ever having been made in Committee in that House in any bill introduced and supported by Ministers. They had the experience of the noble Secretary of State opposite, both in the last and the present Session, as to the absolute impossibility of making any great alteration in a Committee of this House. Only a few days ago they had a Committee up-stairs upon a bill which they found they could not alter; and but the other day they had the Pluralities Bill, which had been recommitted half-a-dozen times, and he had himself waited more than once for three hours attending upon it, but it was found impossible to introduce any alteration. If this were the case generally, how was it to be effected when the alterations particularly wished went to the very foundation of the measure? But there was another view of this case which was highly important to his noble friends (Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe), and those who acted with them, and wished for the second reading of the Bill. The noble

---

* Hansard's Debates, Third Series, vol. vii. p. 980.

Earl opposite (Earl Grey) had, it was true, shown more moderation and more courtesy upon the present than upon the former occasion; but then the noble Earl had not held out any hope of agreeing to alterations in the Committee. The noble Earl had, as he heard, held out hopes to a rev. Prelate that alterations might be introduced, but he was sure his noble friends would find when they were in Committee, that their objections would be met, no doubt, with great politeness and attention, but no alteration would they have conceded to them. Under these circumstances, he hoped that noble Lords would not follow the example of his noble friends, and, as they had changed, that noble Lords would not vote for them this year as they had the last. With respect to what had fallen from another noble Earl (the Earl of Haddington) who had pursued the same course last year, but who last night had come to a different conclusion, and asked was there no hope of a compromise? He would ask, had not these noble Lords been trying to compromise for the last six months? If they had not succeeded in that time, what encouragement was there to him (the Duke of Wellington) or others to follow their example? He, and those who thought with him, knew the consequences of the Bill, and that it would consign the country to evils which it could not survive with prosperity. He knew that it was a Bill which, in its present state, ought not to pass, and he would ask his noble friends, had they been able to advance one single step in their compromise from last October to the present day? If this were the case, he hoped that those who intended to act with his noble friends would understand, that there was no more chance of compromise on the present than on the last occasion; and that if they agreed to the second reading, they agreed to a Bill under which the country could not be governed. He begged, then, that noble Lords would look to the responsibility they took upon themselves in giving support to this Bill. The Ministers were now decidedly responsible for that Bill—they were responsible for the election of the House of Commons that had passed it—they were responsible for the excitement which had caused both these events, and they were moreover responsible for any evil consequences which might occur if this House rejected it. Those noble Lords who changed their sentiments, followed as they were by many who had voted against the Bill the last time, would partake, he begged them to understand, of a large portion of this serious responsibility, and the country would look to them to answer for whatever might occur. He had been hitherto considering the misfortune he laboured under in differing from his noble friends, but he should now come to the Bill itself. His objection to the Bill had always been, that it went to overturn the system of Representation of the country—that it destroyed all the ancient franchises unnecessarily for the purpose of Reform, and disfranchised totally fifty-six boroughs, and partially thirty boroughs—that it totally revolutionized the Representation of Scotland, for it was impossible to consider the present without reference to the Scotch Bill, and that it put an end to all those arrangements which, only three years ago, had been entered into for the final settlement of the Catholic Question. The noble Earl (Earl Grey) had yesterday challenged him to make out that this Bill was revolutionary. What he had always said was, that it had a revolutionary tendency, and he thought it had a tendency so strong in that way that it must lead to revolution. The noble Earl had said there was no violence, but it was well understood that a revolution might be effected by law as well as by violence, and the present was not a case in which violence could have any effect even were it had recourse to. One of the great and leading objections in his mind to this measure was, that it was one which went to destroy that most invaluable principle of our existing Constitution the principle of prescription, which sanctioned the descent and secured the possession of all kinds of property in this country. This Bill went to destroy a number of boroughs—some holding by prescription, some by charter—and for no reason whatever, except that such was the will of the Minister of the day. There was no man who possessed property under the advantages which the present system afforded to all holders of property, but must run a great risk as to the security of that property under such a state of things as this measure, if it should be passed, was sure to introduce into this country. Nor was this the only objection in this regard which he had to this Bill. He had shown to their Lordships, from the paper which he had already read, that nothing could be more arbitrary than the manner in which some boroughs were deprived of the right of voting altogether, others deprived of it in part, and in which the right of voting was conferred on other places by the same measure. Undoubtedly nothing could be more arbitrary than the manner in which the franchise was conferred by this Bill in some of those boroughs. Instead of the existing rights of voting in cities and boroughs, this Bill went to establish one uniform right of voting in all municipal elections throughout the country, which must inevitably tend to make the constitution of Parliament a complete democracy. The noble Earl near to him had said, that the uniformity of the right of voting, which this Bill would establish, was, in his mind, one of the benefits of the measure. Did that noble Earl never hear of Unions carrying on a correspondence with one another in different parts of the country? Did he never hear of such Unions corresponding with one another on political topics, and on topics connected with the elections, as well as on topics connected with trade and commerce? But those objections which he had stated to the Bill referred principally to the municipal towns of a smaller size. When they came to consider the larger towns, it would be found that the right of voting which this measure would establish there, would amount to neither more nor less than Universal Suffrage. In fact, this Bill would in such places, extend the right of voting to mere lodgers—to men who paid only 3*s.* 10*d.* a-week, or 7*d.* a-night, for their lodging. Such a residence would, to such men in the larger municipal towns, give the right of voting at elections of Members of Parliament; and such was the constituency they were to establish if they should go into Committee on this Bill, for their Lordships would not forget that the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government took occasion to tell them in the course of his speech last night, that nothing must be done to destroy the efficiency of that part of the Bill. He would wish to lead their lordships a little further in order to consider what must be the operation of such a constituency as that in the elections of Members of Parliament. The noble Earl had told them that men possessing property in those boroughs must continue to have political influence in the elections there, and that was one of his arguments in support of this part of the Bill. But he would appeal to their Lordships whether their own experience in matters of that description confirmed the correctness of that statement? It was true, that in some of those boroughs, Noblemen possessing large properties in the neighbourhood of them would possess still a great and paramount influence. He begged to observe that, in point of fact, one of the consequences of this measure in that respect would be, that several of those places would be left in the hands of Noblemen entirely, so as greatly to increase, beyond what it was at present, that influence which they possessed with respect to the formation of every government which could be carried on by the King of England. But generally speaking, in those towns, it would be the demagogue, and not the gentleman of property, who would possess the influence over the elections there. The latter could not command such an influence, unless through the means of an expenditure which it would be impossible for him to support. But the demagogue could obtain it by other means, and it was by demagogues that such places would be represented in Parliament. He begged their Lordships to observe, what would be the effect of such a state of things in the constitution of the House of Commons, and he begged to ask them whether, with such men, the Representatives of those boroughs, it would be possible to carry on any thing like a government, or a steady system of policy, through the means of that assembly. He knew that, according to the Constitution of this country, a Member of the House of Commons, when he came there, was a member for all parts of England, and not a Representative for the particular town or place for which he had been elected: he was in fact looked upon as a member of a common council for all parts of England. That had been hitherto the meaning which was attached to the character of a Member of the Commons House of Parliament. But the case would be widely different should this Bill be passed, and Members of Parliament subjected to a system of instruction on the part of their constituents. That system already existed in parts of England, and more especially in the metropolis, and in the borough of Southwark. Their Lordships would remember, that an hon. and gallant Officer, formerly connected with the party of the noble Lords opposite, had been obliged to retire from the representation of Southwark last summer, because he had happened to differ with his constituents; and that a worthy Alderman had, in a similar manner been reprimanded by his constituents in the city of London, for a similar offence. What, then, was to be expected hereafter should the system of this Bill be established in this country? Why, that every Member of the House of Commons would become the mere delegate of his constituents, instead of the Representative of the people at large. It had been well observed by his noble friend near him in his speech last night, that such Representatives would, in each particular case, merely consult the wishes of their respective constituents, and act upon them, instead of consulting together according to the best of their judgments, for the common good. And here he could not avoid referring to a letter written by a gentleman in the course of last Autumn to some of his constituents in this neighbourhood, in which he not only declared that the constituents were to advise and point out the course which their Representatives should pursue in Parliament, but in which he went still further; for, in this document, addressed to the parish of St. George's-in-the-East, the writer told them, that there ought to be an union in every parish of all the middle and working classes, and that the object of them should be, in the first instance, the protection of persons and property; and, secondly, in order to be ready to express the opinion of the parish upon any public measure, and, in case the Ministers or the House of Commons should be lukewarm, that such unions would be ready to urge them on to the performance of their duty. The extract which he had just read to their Lordships, was taken from a letter written by one of the great advocates of the Reform Bill, not for the sake of the Reform Bill itself, but because it would lead to something further. That letter afforded a proof of the kind of system which would be put into operation with respect to the Members of the House of Commons should this Bill be passed. Let them for a moment compare the system this Bill would establish with the system of representation which had so long existed in this country, and under which this country had been raised to such an eminence of glory, and power, and prosperity. They had, under the existing system, the county representation, and the representation in cities and boroughs. The county representation consisted principally of freeholders, and the Members for counties represented not only the lower classes, but the middle and higher orders. The Representatives for the great maritime towns, and for the larger description of towns in the interior of the country, represented likewise the lower and middle classes. The Representatives for the potwallopping boroughs, for the scot-and-lot boroughs, and for the single borough of Preston, where he believed the franchise was vested in the inhabitants at large, represented the lowest orders of the people; and in that manner this borough representation represented all classes and descriptions of persons who had any thing to do with the business transacted in the House of Commons. Instead of that system which had raised this country to its present elevation, they were called upon to establish by this Bill a system of elections which would be confined to one single class of the community; and, as the county representation would be no check upon that class of persons, the voters in the counties being mostly of the same description, and as the united representation of Scotland and of Ireland would be no check upon them, such a system would lead at once to a complete democracy. Such was the system which they were called upon to establish in lieu of the Constitution which at present existed, and under which all those classes and interests in this country that ought to be represented were really represented in Parliament; and, under such a system as that, it was pretended that they would be able to carry on the general business of the nation. He would here beg to call their Lordships' attention to the changes which had taken place in the Government of this country in the course of the last century, and more especially in the latter portion of that period, and what improvement had taken place in that time in the popular system in this country. His noble friend behind him had last night truly stated, that the influence of the Crown had been decreasing from the period of the Revolution up to the year 1782; and that it had been still further diminishing from that period up to the present time, till at last there were not more than fifty persons in the House of Commons holding public offices. In that period, and more especially in latter years, the influence of the

Crown in that respect had been greatly diminished. First of all there had been a large reduction of all such kind of offices, and in the next place, in consequence of the consolidation of the different Boards of Customs, Excise, and other public departments, the influence which had been formerly possessed by the Crown had been taken out of its hands, and placed in the hands of the public. Their Lordships must, therefore, see that the influence derived by the Crown from all such offices had been greatly diminished, and possibly to a greater degree than it ought to have been for the purposes of the Government of the country. With the influence of the Crown thus diminished, if a Bill of this description should be passed, it would be impossible to carry on the Government of the country. Another important consideration to be attended to in the discussion of this measure related to the changes which had taken place in this country in the course of the last four years. In the year 1828, they repealed the Test Act, and the effect of this measure was, to bring into operation a large body of electors, who had, of course, much influence on the election. In the year 1829, the Catholic Bill was passed, and that measure, too, was calculated to have a most important effect upon the constitution of Parliament. Now they should give time to those measures, in order to see the effect which they would produce on the constitution of Parliament and of the country, before they proceeded to pass a still further and more extensive measure, the effect of which would be, to introduce still greater alterations into the Constitution of the country. There could be no doubt that those measures to which he had just alluded, must have a considerable effect on the elections, and more especially when any measure like this measure of Parliamentary Reform was adopted to the extent contemplated in this Bill. "There can be no doubt (continued the noble Duke) that there is a general desire in the country—I do not deny the existence of it, for it is stated in all the addresses and all the petitions on the subject—that there is a general desire in the country that some Reform in Parliament should be taken into consideration, to do away with the abuses in the system of election of Members of the House of Commons. Without inquiring into the cause if the fact be as I have stated, I believe that no one will dispute that it is the duty of Parliament to proceed gradually in making amendments in the Representation. We should consider maturely every step that we take—we should not proceed all at once to do every thing, we should go on gradually and deliberately, and thus in process of time, we might arrive even at the measure which has been recommended by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government. But that must be in process of time. After a considerable length of time has elapsed, and after we have maturely considered every step to be taken, and seen some, at least, of its consequences, it is only after we have done all that, that we can adopt a measure to the extent of that recommended by the noble Earl. This your Lordships must do, and do it gradually and slowly, if you desire to maintain the venerable monarchy under which the country has flourished for such a long time." He must further observe, that, if such a measure as this should be suddenly and at once passed, it would be impossible to conduct hereafter the Government of the country. They had been told, that it was necessary to bring this question to an early conclusion, because the trade, and commerce, and business of the country were suffering in consequence of delaying the settlement of it. Such was the statement of the noble Earl opposite. Now, he wished that those who stated that such inconveniences were felt at present in this country, would consider a little whether they were felt in consequence of the prospect of the passing of this Bill, or in consequence of the fear of losing it. That was a most important consideration in looking at this question. He was of opinion that, as soon as this Bill was proposed, and as soon as the excitement which it occasioned arose, a great portion of the expenditure ceased—that men ceased to lay out their money in great enterprises—that those who had previously lived to the full amount of their incomes, began now to consider it their interest to contract their expenditure, in order to make provision for a period of trouble and difficulty; and it was to those circumstances that he was disposed to attribute the want of commerce and of trade in the country. If they looked for a moment at the present situation of their neighbours, the French, they would behold precisely similar effects following from precisely similar causes, and precisely similar consequences produced there that they had to complain of in this country. Those consequences, to be sure, had proceeded to a greater extent there than with us, because the excitement had continued for a longer period, and because the delirium had been carried to a greater extent; but he was certain that, if this Bill should be now passed, we should soon witness here similar effects. He complained of the present system of agitation and excitement because the evil effects of it fell principally on the lowest and poorest class of the community. That contraction of the expenditure to which he had alluded, no doubt, tended to diminish the comforts of the middle classes, but it tended directly to affect the very subsistence of the poor. It was on such grounds that he complained of the present system of agitation, that was carried on in this country. The noble Viscount, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, had admitted in his speech last night, that he did not expect any relief to the distress of the country from this measure. It was, certainly, an extraordinary thing for a Minister, and especially, for a Secretary of the Home Department, to say, that he did not think, that in fact he was satisfied, that a measure of such immense consequence as this must be, would not tend to relieve any of the distresses of the country. Extraordinary, however, as that was, he would maintain, that, so far from relieving any portion of the distresses of this country, this measure tended very much to aggravate every one of them. But let them go a little further, and see whether this system would give them what it was said it would give them, a cheap Government. And here again he begged to call the attention to what was passing in another country. If their Lordships would take the trouble of examining into what had passed within the last two years in France, they would see that the French expenditure had been increased in that time fifty millions sterling beyond the usual expenditure. They would see that its ordinary Budget, notwithstanding the study that had been applied to be as saving as possible, exceeded the Budget of the former reigns—of the extravagant reign of the Bourbons—by the amount of ten millions sterling; and, besides this, there was the extraordinary expenditure of fifty millions in two years. Look at that, as a system of cheap Government, and their Lordships would see that it was quite impossible to agree with the senseless assertions made on that subject. Let their Lordships further see whether this Bill, supposing it to be passed, was likely to make the Government cheaper or better than it was now. Let them ask themselves, whether the civil Government would have more power to govern the country than it now possessed; whether it was possible that the Government could be carried on with a smaller proportion of military. He begged their Lordships to look at the transactions at Paris, in the course of the last two years, and see whether that had been the case. He was sure they could not think so, when they saw that, while Louis 18th and Charles 10th were on the Throne, they were enabled to maintain the peace of Paris with a gendarmerie of from 500 to 1,000 men; but that since the Revolution of July, the Government had not had less than 60,000 men once a month put into requisition to maintain the peace of the city. If the system now proposed was carried into execution, the result would be, to establish a similarly expensive military Government in this country. It was impossible that, under such circumstances, the Government of the country could be carried on as it was at present by the Civil Power aided by a small military force. In the course of the last year, events of a fearful character had occurred both in this country and in France—he alluded to what had taken place at Bristol and Lyons, and these showed the different power and efficiency of the existing Governments of England and France. The calamity at Bristol was at once put an end to, by less than 100 soldiers, as soon as an officer at the head of a military detachment was found to do his duty: whereas it required not less than 4,000 of the best troops in France, with the Minister of War and the Prince of the blood at their head, to quell, in the same time, the disturbances that had taken place at Lyons. If their Lordships would consider well the consequences of those differences, and the circumstances themselves, they would then be able to judge whether it was possible for them to expect to carry on the civil Government of England as hitherto under a system of Government such as they were going to establish if they should pass this Bill. He begged pardon for having trespassed so long on their Lordships. He had endeavoured to convince their Lordships that his noble friend (the Earl of Harrowby) was taking a course inconsistent with the opinions —the well-founded opinions—which he had expressed, with regard to the Reform Bill in October last, that his noble friend's taking such a course, was no reason why their Lordships should follow his example, and, by adopting the course which his noble friend recommended to them, involve themselves in all the responsibility of sanctioning the present measure; and he had finally endeavoured to convince their Lordships, and he trusted he had succeeded in the attempt, that the only safe course for them and for the country was, for them to reject this Bill on the second reading. There was one other point on which he wished to say a few words. He meant the measure of which his noble friend near him (the Duke of Buckingham) had given notice last night. If his noble friend should bring that measure forward, he (the Duke of Wellington) would certainly give it all the consideration which was due to his noble friend and to the measure itself, and he hoped their Lordships would do so too. He had no knowledge of the measure of his noble friend, except what could be derived from the notice he had given of it last night; nor was he previously aware that it was the intention of his noble friend to bring forward any measure of such a description. It appeared to him, as far as he could judge of the measure of his noble friend from the notice of it before their Lordships, that it was one founded on a different principle from that now before their Lordships.

The Earl of *Haddington*, in explanation, said, that when he used the word "compromise" in his speech last night, he had, perhaps, employed a word that was not exactly the best chosen. What he meant to do was, to express a hope that the noble Duke who had just spoken, and the noble Earl at the head of the Government, would go into the Committee in a spirit of conciliation and concession. As to what the noble Duke imagined, that he had something to do with negotiations, which the noble Duke supposed to have been going on for the last three months out of that House, he could assure the noble Duke that, if there had been such negotiations, he had had nothing to do with them.

Lord *Grantham* stated, that he should not detain the House more than a few moments; but the question now before them was one of such importance as to make him feel that it was his duty to break through the silence he had before observed on this question, and not to give a silent vote on this occasion. He had applied his mind with painful anxiety to the consideration of the subject—he was most anxious to alter, if he could, the vote he had given six months ago; however, he could not. He had then voted against the Bill, and he should be compelled to repeat that vote on the present occasion. It was a painful consideration for him to be obliged to do so, but he could not avoid it. He had then been anxious to see if he could concur with the reasons for sending the Bill into a Committee; he was equally anxious upon that subject now. The reason that induced him to say he could not consent to send the Bill into Committee was, because he thought the chance of amending it there was hopeless. It was true that the noble Earl at the head of the Government had told them that any suggestion from that side of the House would not be thrown away; but it was observable, that, both last night, and the night on which the noble Earl had introduced the Bill to their notice, he made the statement in a manner so guarded, and betrayed so much anxiety not to go too far, that he must candidly confess he had not much expectations of the good that would come from the Committee. From the beginning of the agitation of the question he did not think it had been quite treated with the openness and the candour it deserved. It was a question of great importance—it involved the interests of every class of the community, and yet it had been pushed on with a degree of violence such as had never before been shown with regard to any other great public business. Questions of great interest had heretofore been laid before Parliament, they had received much discussion, and when the decision of Parliament was hostile to the public sentiment at the time they had been deferred or re-considered. Important questions—such as the Slave Question and the Catholic Question—had been subject to repeated examination, and Parliament had dealt with them according to its deliberate opinion, and never before had that House been branded when it dissented from any such measures with merely uttering the whisper of a faction. The conduct which had been observed towards every one of those noblemen and gentlemen, who, in the fair discharge of their duty, had opposed this measure, had been he would assert, disgraceful to the country. A system of intimidation had prevailed from the first moment that the subject was agitated until the present. That system of intimidation was, indeed, different at one time from what it appeared at another. They were, in the first instance, threatened by anonymous miscreants with a visitation of brickbats and bludgeons. That threat had failed. But now the threatening assumed a more formidable character. The intimidation that was at present resorted to directed their attention to future consequences. It was that feeling, he presumed, which had induced his noble friend (Lord Wharncliffe), who had changed his sentiments on this subject, to give a vote different from that which he had given last year. Future consequences, it seemed, were considered by him as likely to give a more severe blow than that which could be inflicted by brickbats. He contended that a scheme of intimidation had been employed, to make this question succeed from the very beginning to the present hour. To himself, personally, he could assure their Lordships the decision of this question was a matter of perfect indifference. He never had had any thing to do with an election in his life. He had no relations to provide for by the exercise of parliamentary influence. He was not one of those "liveried lacqueys," to use one of the phrases which had been invented to insult their Lordships, who trafficked in parliamentary patronage. He repeated, that he was completely independent. It was a matter of perfect indifference to him personally, how they dealt with this Bill. But viewing it as a measure fraught with danger to the Constitution—seeing so many risks of evil connected with it—and being quite hopeless of amending it—he felt himself compelled, as a man of honour, in the discharge of a great public duty, to give his decided vote against it.

Lord *Wharncliffe* regretted very deeply that, on this occasion, he felt himself called upon to differ from the opinion of his noble friend (the Duke of Wellington) who had recently addressed the House. He must first observe, that the question on which they were then deliberating was not with respect to the Bill itself, but with respect to the mode in which they were about to treat it. He asserted, that it must be read a second time, unless they had made up their minds to encounter greater difficulties than they had encountered before; and his belief was, that, on the contrary, if they read the Bill a second time—if they only gave it their consideration—they would enable themselves, if not to get rid of it altogether, at least to introduce into it many changes that they might think desirable. At all events, they would, by such a course, be enabled to consider its provisions thoroughly, and satisfy the people by doing so. Allusion had been made by his noble friend to a speech which he had delivered in March, 1831. He had then said, that if the Parliament were dissolved, the House of Commons, in a new Parliament, would be a house of delegates. So he said then; and he would assert now, that the House of Commons was, to all intents and purposes, a house of delegates to pass this Bill of Reform. His noble friend had said, that "we ought to call on Ministers to place us in the same situation in which we stood before the bringing in of the Reform Bill." How could this be done? Let his noble friend look to what had passed since this measure was first introduced. Let him consider what had occurred in the last six months. Had not this question of Reform, after the dissolution of Parliament, made such a stride that it could not now be repressed? Neither Ministers, nor the noble Duke himself, great as were his abilities, could alter the feeling which now prevailed. No effort could bring the country back to the situation in which it was placed prior to the last election. "But," said the noble Duke, "the House of Commons is so constituted that they will pass many bills of this kind. I do not wonder at it," He (Lord Wharncliffe) believed, that the Commons would pass many such bills if their Lordships refused to consider the present. They might retard, for a time, the progress of a Reform measure, but they could not throw back the feeling which had called for it. The present Bill had been twice carried by great majorities in the House of Commons; it was approved of by the Crown, and it was backed by the people. When they saw this support given to the Bill—a support greater than ever they had seen on any former occasion—did not that afford a sufficient reason why they should permit this Bill to go into Committee? His noble friend said, further, that the present difficulties might be surmounted by Government; certainly, he thought the Government were the cause of the existing difficulty; but he must deny that now they had the power of obviating it. By adopting the course which his noble friend advocated, one of two things must be effected—either the Ministry must advise his Majesty to send down a message recommending them not to discuss the question of Parliamentary Reform, or the Parliament be dissolved. In case of the latter event, what would be the consequence? He believed that, if Parliament were now dissolved, they would, by a new election, have a worse House of Commons than at present. It was to avoid this that he called on their Lordships—that he called on every man who had not set his face against all Reform, not to throw back upon the House of Commons a measure which had been thus sent up to their Lordships; but to try whether they could not so improve it as to make it agreeable to all parties. The noble Duke had said, that before the revolution in France and Belgium, in 1830, there was no such thing as a call for Reform. Good God! how could the noble Duke make such an assertion? Did he not recollect the proceedings on the East Retford question? Did he not call to mind the increasing minorities on the Reform question? Did he not know that the Reform question was, the last time, only defeated by a majority of forty-eight? He (Lord Wharncliffe) had said, "Let us give the elective franchise to Birmingham, instead of East Retford." That proposition was resisted, and the consequence was, that the question had come before them in a new form. The fact, unfortunately, was, that the noble Duke was entirely wrong on this subject. The noble Duke had passed a great part of his life in the glorious service of his country, and, in common with every Englishman, he felt grateful to him for his exertions; but still he must say, that the noble duke had not witnessed the progress of political feeling in this country. He said this with all respect for the noble Duke, who, he was sure, would not suspect him of saying anything that could be personally unpleasing to him. He would, however, say, that he conceived himself to be a better witness of passing events in this country than the noble Duke was. He (Lord Wharncliffe) had been in Parliament for a great number of years; he had represented large bodies of people, and, as long as he could recollect, this question of Parliamentary Reform had been proceeding. The sense and feeling of a grievance in that respect, whether right or wrong, had constantly prevailed. He recollected no time in which it could be said to have ceased. It was a common mistake, not only with his noble friend, but with other eminent statesmen, and, amongst the rest, with his late friend, Mr. Canning, to think that the people were not anxious with respect to the question of Reform. He had heard Mr. Canning say, when there was a lull on the subject, that the people thought nothing about Parliamentary Reform. But he (Lord Wharncliffe) judged very differently. Living in the midst of a great population, he knew what their feelings were, and he said to Mr. Canning, "You are mistaken; that lull is deceptive. The question will arise again, and, in the end, something must be done." The result proved that he was right. The noble Duke had said, that if the King's name had not been used, there would not have been such a loud and general cry for Reform. He admitted the fact to a certain extent, and he disapproved of the use of the King's name; but still he could not conceal from himself that there was a strong feeling in the country in favour of Reform, aggravated probably, but certainly not created, by the belief that his Majesty was also favourable to it. He believed, however, that, if their Lordships would consent to read the Bill a second time, and to go into Committee with it, there was so much good sense in the people of this country, that, if they afterwards rejected it, they would be held justified, but that if they refused to give it a second reading, and sent it back to the House of Commons, he would tell them, if they did so, that, one day or other, this measure, or perhaps a worse and more sweeping measure, must pass. For his own part, he believed that the constitution of Parliament was the best that ever was devised, or put together, for the purposes of legislation; but it was not sufficient that he should be satisfied of that fact, it was necessary that the people should be, also, satisfied of it. It was not sufficient that the noble Duke and himself—it was not sufficient that many wise men held that opinion—it was, as he had before said, necessary that the people should entertain the same feeling. The noble Duke had quoted the speech made by him in October last with respect to the difficulty of dealing with this Bill in Committee. He still adhered to the same opinion. He was aware of the difficulties which were to be encountered; but their Lordships must not, on that account, refuse to assent to the second reading of the Bill. Those who were not opposed to all Reform might endeavour to make the Bill better than it was; and, in his opinion, it was not a matter of impossibility to improve the Bill in such a manner that all, or almost all, would be willing to agree to it. The refusal to consider the Bill in Committee, on account of its principle, appeared to him now to be impolitic. He would beg the noble Duke, and other noble Lords, to consider well the force of that argument, and the extent to which it might hereafter be pushed. Was it right that they, as one body of the Legislature, should declare that they could not in Committee consider a measure affecting the vital interests of the country?—that they could not in Committee alter its provisions? If such a position were once admitted, then they must be considered as a body incapable of framing laws themselves, or of altering laws that came from the House of Commons, but having the power merely of assenting to, or dissenting from, any measures that were sent up to them from the other House. That argument, he contended, was an argument of a most dangerous nature. It was said, that he and another noble Lord, who now meant to vote for the second reading, would thereby relieve Ministers from the responsibility which at present rested with them on account of this measure. He could not see how they, by so voting, removed that responsibility. Were they the persons who brought in the measure? Certainly not. What, then, was the responsibility which they incurred? All they did was, that they allowed the Bill to be brought in, and to be submitted to a Committee for examination, to see whether it could be so altered as to form an efficient law. If he permitted the Bill to be introduced, and to go through an additional stage, in the hope of effecting beneficial alterations in it, what responsibility, he asked, did he incur? If, in the Committee, he found that it could not be beneficially altered, he should then know how to act. How then should he stand before the country? He should stand before the country thus; that he had shown a disposition to listen to the claim which had been made upon the Legislature. He wished to proceed in that way, following his own plain sense of duty, and by that alone would he be guided. The responsibility, he averred, did not rest with him, nor with those who might act with him, but remained, and must ever remain, with the Government, for having brought forward this measure. It was their Lordships' duty to give this Bill a second reading, for the circumstances of the country, and the feelings of the country, were changed, and materially changed, since a similar measure was last before them. He would show that to their Lordships in the first place; secondly, he would point out the effects of concession as opposed to rejection; and, lastly, he would endeavour to show their Lordships the inevitable result of obstinacy. The effect of rejection, in this instance, would be, in his opinion, to place all those who voted against the second reading of the Bill in a perilous situation with the country. Though several of those who formerly voted against the measure stated, both at that time and immediately afterwards, that they were not opposed to all Reform, still it could not be denied, that, in spite of those declarations, the result of their vote had been the introduction of a feeling that they could not agree to any Reform whatsoever, or, at all events, to any effectual Reform. In giving his vote on that occasion, he was anxious, as many others were, to give the country an opportunity of reconsidering the subject. The country had been appealed to, and he thought that the appeal had totally failed. Those who had voted with him were not supported by the country, as he supposed they would have been. He must admit, that there had been no re-action, and he conceived that a second rejection of this measure might lead to very evil consequences. Addresses had been presented to the Crown, and petitions had been laid before both Houses of Parliament, every one of them, without exception, calling for the enactment of this measure, or, if they deviated from that point at all, they demanded a Bill of a more extended kind. How, then, were they to meet this claim? That there must be Reform was quite evident; but, up to yesterday, no noble Lord had thrown out a single idea on the subject. No one intimated what ought to be done, until the noble Duke (Buckingham) yesterday stated his opinion on the subject. But he would tell the noble Duke that the Bill which he proposed came too late. If it were intended to do good, it should, at least, have been simultaneous with the present measure. It was too late to introduce it when the feelings of the public mind were wrought up to such a state of excitement. But the noble Duke and his friends said, "we cannot read this Bill a second time, because we object to its principle." Now, he would say, that every one of the principles contained in the Bill was to be found in the measure which the noble Duke intended to bring forward. He knew no reason why the Bill should not be considered in Committee. He could not conceive why schedule A and schedule B might not be altered there. In Committee the whole question would be open to them. "But," said the noble Duke, "there is this distinction in my measure—I don't disfranchise any boroughs." Now, if the noble Duke combined two or more boroughs together, and, where at present four Members were returned, allowed only two, if that were not disfranchisement, he did not know what the meaning of the word was. If, however, the noble Duke were afforded the opportunity of bringing forward his measure, he would give to it every consideration in his power. But that circumstance should not divert him from voting for the investigation of the present Bill in Committee. The vote of October had placed their Lordships in this situation—that the country looked upon them as masters or dictators, who would not give to the people that which, rightly or wrongly he would not say, they now claimed. He felt that that vote, though it might have displeased the country, had yet been the means of increasing the respect of the people towards them, inasmuch as it showed them that their Lordships acted from an independent feeling. The people were glad to see that their Lordships asserted their right to maintain their own opinion on this subject, and that they would not allow themselves to be influenced by low and vulgar intimidation, or by that higher species of intimidation to which the noble Lord who last addressed them had alluded. If it were true, as had been stated over and over again, that the noble Lord opposite had the power in his hands of carrying this measure, and that he had refrained from using it, such conduct, in his opinion, reflected very great credit on the noble Earl. If this measure were finally carried by a proceeding of the sort to which he had alluded, that, in itself, he conceived, would constitute a revolution. If that House was not to have a free voice in the discussion on this subject—if, because it hesitated to adopt a Bill sent up by the House of Commons, it was to be swamped by new Members; if so violent a measure were to be taken, that House would become an assembly hereafter to be despised. But he would again ask their Lordships, was not this measure a fit one to be maturely considered in Committee? Any Minister that put forward such a measure as this, incurred, they must all admit, the greatest responsibility ever encountered by man; but that formed no reason why they should not give due attention to the measure. They ought to take care that they did not incur any responsibility by refusing to consider this Bill, when they could, by a very easy course, avoid that responsibility. They should recollect, not only that the House of Commons, but that the Crown also, approved of this measure. It would not be wise, therefore, to reject it without giving it that consideration which its great importance deserved. He assured their Lordships that the feeling of the country was now entirely changed. They had not now to apprehend any of that sort of violence which they before dreaded. A calm had come over the public mind—a lull in that storm of passion had occurred; but this was the very reason why they should now act—the very reason why they should take advantage—why they should now deal with the Bill before them differently from that of last year. They had no longer to encounter the cry of "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill;" and they had now an opportunity given to them, which might never again return to them, of moderating this measure in some degree to their wishes. He was satisfied that it was hopeless to think of getting rid of the question of Reform altogether. Nay, he would say more, that, whatever Government might be in power, it would have not only to bring forward a measure of Reform, but a measure of Reform on the very principles of the Bill now before them. Let them consider what those principles were. They must not look for them in the clauses of the Bill, as some of their Lordships seemed to imagine, but in the preamble of the Bill.

He said, then, that any one who did not oppose Reform altogether, must grant it upon the principles contained in that preamble. To prove this, he begged to ask, what were the abuses of the present system talked of, not only by Reformers, but by anti-Reformers? No one could deny that the first and foremost of them all was, the existence of boroughs which, whether rightly or wrongly, were supposed to be nomination boroughs, which sent Members to Parliament independent of any constituency whatever. The principle of Reform, then, was, to get rid of a certain number of these boroughs. He agreed with the noble Lord, the late President of the Board of Control, who addressed the House last night, in lamenting the loss of those boroughs, and doubted whether any scheme of Representation that might be devised could put them in possession of so much useful service as was afforded by those boroughs. But again he said, they were not to deceive themselves upon this point. The word had gone forth, those boroughs had become an object of detestation to the people (whether rightly or not was another question), who now thought them places which made the House of Commons an assembly of people who disposed of their property and drew their money from their pockets, without their having any control over their choice into that House. This, in the times they now lived, would no longer be endured, and, more or less, every Member of the House of Commons must in a certain degree depend upon the people. It was their Lordships' duty now to regulate that dependence as far as in them lay, but upon some description of constituency, he would venture to predict, whatever might be the issue of this Bill, every Member of the House of Commons must in future depend. The next point was, the enfranchisement of the great towns. This was almost universally given up as a disputed point; scarcely any man, not even the noble Duke near him, venturing to say that those towns ought not to return Members to Parliament. After having admitted these two principles—disfranchisement and enfranchisement—was it possible to say, that the constituency could remain in its present state? To show the impossibility of it, he would only refer to the town of Bath. The Members for that place were returned by the very small body of persons who constituted the Corporation, who were said to be much under the influence of one noble Lord. Could any one believe that, whilst nomination boroughs were disfranchised, and representatives were given to large towns, such a city as Bath should be suffered to remain under such a corporation as now governed its elections? He was no Reformer; but, if the boroughs were to be destroyed, large cities could not consistently be suffered to remain under small Corporations. The next principle of the Bill was, to diminish the expense of elections. He did not say that the provisions of the Bill for registrations, &c. would effect that object; but he apprehended that none of his noble friends would say that it was not a desirable object to be obtained. Certain he was, that all who had suffered by the expenses of an election, and particularly of a county election, would feel, however inadequate they might consider the means here taken to diminish the expense of elections, that they ought to be diminished. He, for one, had always been of that opinion, and still retained it. The noble Duke, and many other noble Lords, had only looked at the effects which they supposed would follow the rejection of this Bill, as being the same which took place in October, on their Lordships' rejection of that which was under consideration last. They had talked of riots, and of the possibility of civil war, and upon the duty of the Government to put any attempts of that kind down. No doubt that such was the duty of Government, and great blame would attach to it did it not, under any circumstances, put down any such proceedings. But that was what they had not now to apprehend. They must consider that there had been, for some time, a growing dislike and jealousy in the minds of the people towards their Lordships' House—feelings, which originated in their belief that their Lordships were acting to suit their own purposes and views, and not with any regard to the interests of the community at large. That was a feeling which their Lordships would find it difficult to remove. The House of Lords had, upon many occasions, refused, over and over again, to pass bills sent up to them by the House of Commons. Their Lordships did so in the case of the Catholic Relief Bill more than once; but at last they passed it. He did not mean to say that, if they had thought fit again to reject it—if they had been so unwise as to adopt that course—that they might not have done so. They would have had the support, if not of the majority, yet certainly of a very large portion, of the people of this country. But how would the matter stand with them if they refused to pass this Bill? They would not have a House of Commons nearly divided in opinion, but a House of Commons which had twice sent them up this Bill, backed by large majorities. Would they have the people, or even a portion of the people, on their side? What could they depend upon to support them in their opposition to the House of Commons? He entreated them to consider of this matter, and to consult the persons with whom they were in the habit of living, to ascertain whether the country was prepared to back their rejection of this Bill? He knew that there were a few, out of both Houses of Parliament, upon whom no responsibility rested, ready to urge the most violent measures—ready to call on both Houses to stand stoutly and firmly; but who, when called upon for their support, invariably slunk into corners, leaving those, who had been credulous enough to believe in their silly boasting, to bear all the odium of what they themselves had urged. There might be such people who told them, in their private communication, and in newspapers—"Resist, and we will support you." But where would they be found when wanted? But their Lordships were told that, if they agreed to the second reading of this Bill, they granted the principle of it; and the word principle seemed absolutely to frighten their Lordships. But, because he or any other noble Lord might vote for the second reading, it could not be said that they were bound to vote for the 10*l.* clause or schedule A. They pledged themselves to no such thing. All they pledged themselves to was, to consider the 10*l.* clause and schedule A in the Committee. He agreed that no man could vote for the second reading who was not willing to concede Parliamentary Reform of some kind or other; but they might agree to the second reading, and afterwards deal with the Bill as they pleased. His noble friend, the late President of the Board of Control, last night made a speech which he could not sufficiently admire, in defence of the borough system. It was by far the best defence of that system he had ever heard made, and he could not help feeling sorry that that speech had not been given at an earlier period of these discussions, when it might possibly have done some good. But now he must say of it as he did of the Reform Bill of the noble Duke (Buckingham), that it came all too late. The public feeling on the subject of these boroughs was too strong to be resisted, and took away that respect from the House of Commons which it ought to inspire; and, whatever advantages that system might have, he was afraid that, even if it were now continued, it would not operate on the Government of the country as heretofore, but produce more evil than good. It was undoubtedly true that they afforded the great advantage of returning eminent men, who could not obtain a seat in Parliament by other means; but it was better to find a remedy for what he admitted was a great loss, than to endeavour to uphold a system which had become so repugnant to the feelings of the people, and had been so unequivocally condemned by public opinion. He thought a lesson might be read on this subject in the last fifty years, not unworthy of their Lordships' notice. He begged them to look back to the events connected with the American war. Early in their attempt to tax America, able persons in this country warned the Government of the consequences of the course it was entering upon, and begged it to desist. They, at the present day, might marvel at the manner in which the Government fruitlessly continued that struggle. Its end was a great loss of blood and treasure on our part, but it insured independence on the part of the Americans. Early in the contest conciliation might have brought about something of an accommodation; but, in spite of repeated warnings, they refused to take measures of conciliation, and America was lost to us. Let them look also to the struggle which took place in Ireland, with respect to commercial freedom. It was refused over and over again, but at last the Government was compelled to yield it. Let them look at the Catholic Question. The Catholics thought, and thought justly, that they were entitled to political freedom. In theory, nothing could be objected to their claim, and their cause was advocated by the greatest statesmen, and the most powerful orators, including Mr. Pitt himself, which this country ever produced. Their Lordships refused to grant the demand of the Catholics; but what happened at last? Their Lordships taught the people of Ireland that the only way to attain their object was, to show some front—to show that they were determined to attain it. The people of Ireland did so, and they succeeded. What had the House obtained by the prolongation of the struggle? It had merely prevented any benefit being reaped from the concession. Had it been made earlier—if that which was right had been granted as soon as asked—if that which was recommended by the wisest of men had been adopted—their Lordships would have made of Ireland a grateful country; but their Lordships forced on agitation, and they had made an ungrateful country of it, and taught the people to use the power which their Lordships now found opposed to them. But was even that all that was likely to result from the refusal of the question now before them? Let them look at the effects of the resistance they had already made to it. Instead of increasing their power to resist, every effort had left them weaker than before, till at last they were left almost without the power even of surrender. This very Bill was a proof of what he had stated. A timely concession would at least have warded off for many years even the proposal of such a plan as was contained in this Bill; but no; they would yield nothing, for fear that the principle being conceded, they should never be able to stop. The consequences of this banking up of the waters had been, that they had become irresistible, and a large measure of Reform must now be granted. His noble friend (the Duke of Wellington) could not now agree with him, but he would venture to say, that the time was not far distant when even the noble Duke himself would confess that this question could no longer be postponed. He admitted that the country had flourished under the system they were about to abolish, but the question was, whether the people who were to be governed were satisfied to be any longer governed by it. The noble Duke said, that they had been asked to compromise, and wished to know what, after negotiating for six months, was the sort of compromise they had made? It was true that, in October last, a negotiation—or rather a conversation—took place (for the word "negotiation" did not properly express what was meant) between the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey,) his noble friend behind him, (Lord Harrowby) and himself. He did not think the noble Earl would suppose it wrong in him to say thus much,—namely that the result of that negotiation, if his noble friend pleased so to call it, was, that they understood each other's views better than they did before, but, in point of fact, came to no satisfactory understanding. So the conferences broke off. But it was true that, since that time, the conversations between himself, his noble friend, and the noble Earl, had been resumed; but he could assure the noble Duke that, as to compromises, none was ever proposed by the Government, nor would either his noble friend or himself have assented to any. His noble friend and himself certainly proposed to make certain alterations in the Reform Bill, which they thought might render it, in some degree a safer measure; but he repeated that there was nothing like a compromise on either side. He appealed to the noble Earl opposite to say whether he did not state correctly what took place. He did not take blame or credit to himself for having been engaged in these conversations; but he must say, that it was not a matter to be ashamed of, either for his noble friend, the noble Earl, or himself, to see how far in conciliatory conversation they might be able to agree. In short, he would say, that nothing had taken place which could affect in any degree, either their honour or their votes in that House. He blamed, quite as much as his noble friend who spoke last, his Majesty's Ministers for placing the House of Lords and the country in the situation they now occupied in reference to each other. When they came into office, he had certainly hoped, from the tone they adopted, and from the declarations they made, that although they were pledged to Reform the Commons House of Parliament, that that Reform would have been such a one as he could have agreed to. He had long since come to the conclusion, that they must give way in some degree on this subject, and therefore he did not oppose the Government. Again, after the Bill was brought in, he took an early opportunity, very much against the wishes of many of his noble friends on that side of the House, of stating his opinion of what would be the effect of bringing forward that fatal Bill, and the effect it had produced on his mind. He did so, for he thought, that even, if after the dissolution of Parliament his Majesty's Government had altered their plan so as to meet the views of those who were disposed to go a certain length in Reform, they might have avoided all the inconveniencies and dangers that had subsequently surrounded them. He styled this a fatal Bill; for he conceived that the effects which had resulted from it ever since the 1st of March, 1831, were such as it would take the country years to recover from—even if it ever recovered from them. Both the bringing forward of the Bill itself, and its protracted discussion, had been most detrimental to every interest in the country; the trading interest, the manufacturing interest, the agricultural interest—in short all classes of the community—were now anxious to have this question settled in some shape or other. If he could believe for one single moment that his vote against the second reading would settle and put an end to this Reform Bill for ever, he would most cheerfully give that vote; and he was persuaded, that although many in the country might be disappointed, yet he felt convinced that the great body of the people, whatever they might think upon the subject of Reform, would be glad to have it even thus disposed of. But it was because he felt conscious that such could not be the effect of now throwing out this Bill that he should vote in favour of the second reading. To reject the Bill, would only be to put off the question for a short time, at the end of which they would find themselves in even a more difficult situation than they occupied at present. He entreated their Lordships to take this Bill into consideration. When it was introduced he was certain that a more moderate measure of Reform would have satisfied the greater part of those who were anxious upon the subject, and if proposed would have carried the votes of many of them who were not favourable to Reform at all. But the Government, as he feared it did upon other occasions, mistook the noise and clamour of the country for its real sense. They did not, in his opinion, behave as statesmen ought to do; but endeavoured to outrun the feelings of the country, and, by granting more than was necessary, to stop demand. The effect of that course had, however, been, to increase the demands of many who, if not so encouraged, would have been satisfied even with less. But upon Ministers rested the responsibility of this Bill. If it should prove hereafter to effect good, let them take the credit; but if all that was dreaded on that side of the House ensued, then let them take the blame, with the deep and bitter sorrow they could not but feel. He was most anxious, however, respecting the result of this measure, and felt that no resolution had ever, in the history of the country, been come to in that House so teeming with important consequences as that which would be come to upon this subject. Once more he entreated them to consider whether they would not at least receive this Bill in order to show the country that they were not adverse to all Reform, to consider whether it was consistent with wisdom and discretion to exercise that right of rejecting the Bill which the Constitution undoubtedly placed in their hands.

The cries of "*adjourn, adjourn*" became general at the conclusion of the noble Lord's speech.

The Earl of Winchilsea moved the adjournment of the Debate which was adjourned accordingly.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, April 10, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. By Mr. KENYON, for Encouraging and Facilitating the Employment of Labourers in Agriculture.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. BURGE, Copies of all Communications made to the Government by Lord Belmore, relative to the Rebellion in Jamaica, received subsequently to those already presented to the House:—On the Motion of Mr. SPRING RICE, of the Sums charged by the Excise under 4 Geo. 4th, cap. 94, for Spirits produced, being short of the Charge by Gravity, of Worts, Attenuation, or Charge from the Low Wines in Ireland; and if any, or what part of these Charges remain unpaid, by whom, and Sums by each, at 5th April, 1832; of the Sums, if any remaining unpaid to Excise in Ireland and Scotland, for additional Duties of 2*d.* and 1*d.* per Gallon on Spirits, under 1 William 4th, cap. 49, by whom, and Sums by each, at 5th April, 1832:—On the Motion of Mr. JAMES E. GORDON, of the Number of Applications to the Board of Education in Ireland for New Schools on their System, or on behalf of Schools already Established, and the Number of Applications complied with, the Place where situated, the Number of Scholars, &c.:—On the Motion of Mr. SHAW, of any Treasury Minute made in pursuance of 1 William 4th, determining the Remuneration to be made for the renewal of Commissions of the Peace in Ireland; of all Pensions paid to the Officers of the Chancery Court Ireland, the Amount of Stamp Duties called the Chancery Fund, and all Orders and Regulations made for the practice of that Court, from May, 1819, to January, 1832, distinguishing each year:—On the Motion of Mr. LAMBERT, of all Sums received by the Board of First Fruits in Ireland from the Union of St. Mary New Ross, during the last twenty years, distinguishing the Amount received in each year.

Petitions presented. By Mr. LAMBERT, from the Inhabitants of Killigney, Chaple, and Rower:—By Mr. WISE, from the Landholders and Inhabitants of Killshcelan, Killaloan, Tipperary, Killenaule, Borris, Multyfarnham, Leary, Lacken Street, Tacamslaine, Enniscorthy, Templeshannon, Gorey, Kilkevan, Clone, Barony of Forth, Barrow, Ballynaslaney, Edermine, Clonmore, Kilrush, Taghmere, Carnew, Lea, Syddam, Mitchelstown, Killeavey, Ennisworth, and Cruisetown, for the Abolition of

Tithes in Ireland:—By Mr. Wyse, from the Inhabitants of Enniscorthy, and Templeshannon, to Suspend the Bill on the Irish Tithes until after the Reform Bills are passed:—By Lord Killeen, from the Inhabitants of Dunsany, Killeen, and Waterford, for an increased Number of Representatives for Ireland; and from Carrabrown, for Equalizing Civil Rights in Galway:—By Mr. Fyshe Palmer, from Reading and Leighton Buzzard, in favour of the Factories Bill:—By Lord George Lennox, from Wisborough Green, Sussex, for a more equitable mode of Apportioning Labours among the Occupiers of Land; and for Levying a Rate upon those refusing to find Employment for their due proportion of Labourers:—By Mr. Chapman, from Bally-James-Duff, against the New System of Education in Ireland.

Gravesend Pier.] Mr. Calvert presented a Petition from the ship-owners and others interested in the free navigation of the river Thames, against the Gravesend Pier Bill. The petitioners complained of the great injury which would arise to the navigation by the erection of the pier, which was proposed to extend 215 feet into the bed of the river, and that a great injustice would be done to the watermen of Gravesend, 1,200 of whom would be thrown out of employment. The petitioners concluded by praying that the Bill might not pass into a law.

Laid on the Table.

The Order of the Day for the third reading of this Bill having been read,

Mr. *Hodges* moved, that the Bill be now read a third time. He supported the Bill, as a great convenience to the public, who, in a short space of time, would have the pier free from all tolls. With respect to the alleged injury to the navigation of the river, he could only say, that the plan had been investigated by the officers of the Board of Admiralty, the Custom House, Trinity House, and the Corporation of the city of London, and the select Committee had been informed by those several officers that the plan was neither objectionable, nor could any inconvenience arise from it. The inconvenience of the present pier was sufficiently proved by the fact that 40,000 persons had landed at a temporary pier at Northfleet, one mile from Gravesend, during the last year. He begged hon. Members to reflect that Gravesend was the Brighton of the lower orders of the metropolis, of whom 120,000 visited it during the last year, and, therefore, the subject was well worthy the consideration of the House.

Sir *Byam Martin* objected to the Bill, under the conviction that the navigation of the river would be injured, for he knew that erections of this description tended much to create dangerous shoals. He should, therefore, move, as an amendment, that the Bill be read a third time this day six months.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, he had some reason to believe the hon. and gallant Admiral's remark was correct, and, therefore, he felt bound to support the Amendment.

Mr. *Hodges* observed, that the gallant Admiral's objection, would, in this instance, be obviated by the manner in which the work in question would be constructed.

Mr. *Briscoe* supported the Bill. He had been on the Committee, and, he considered the intended pier of so much importance to the people who resorted to Gravesend from town, that he would give the Bill his fullest concurrence.

Mr. *Wilks* concurred in what had been advanced in support of the Bill. The public would by it be relieved from the exorbitant demands of the Gravesend watermen for landing passengers, although, he considered, that the Bill ought not to compel persons who did not land at the jetty to pay the dues for the pier.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that unless a provision was introduced into the Bill, to give the public the option of choosing their landing place, he should support the Amendment.

Mr. *Hodges* said, the payment of the pier dues would be only compulsory on those who passed from steam vessels, regularly employed in the conveyance of passengers. There was no such obligation on other vessels.

Mr. *Hunt* said, it appeared from the hon. Member's statement, that those who travelled by hired vessels, were to pay the pier dues while those who sailed in their own were to be exempt. This was hardly fair, particularly when it was said it would throw several hundred watermen out of employment, whose charge for landing passengers was now 4*d.*, while the pier dues were 3*d.*, and this it seemed was to be paid whether they used the pier or not.

A division took place on the Amendment: Ayes 26; Noes 41—Majority 15.

The Bill read a third time.

Two clauses having been added on the Motion of Mr. Hodges by way of rider,

Mr. *Hume* then moved an Amendment on one of the clauses, to the effect that passengers might have the option of landing either above or below the pier without being liable to the dues, which ought only to be payable by those actually making use of the pier.

The House divided on the Amendment; Ayes 45; Noes 21—Majority 24.

The Bill, with the Amendment, passed.

Mr. Hutchinson's Claims.] Mr. *William Brougham* moved for a Select Committee to take into consideration the claim of Mr. Bury Hutchinson on the East-India Company. The hon. Member said, this was one of those cases in which a private individual with the knowledge and concurrence of the Indian Government, made a loan to one of the native princes of that country. The uncle of the petitioner, Mr. John Hutchinson, in 1784, when the Rajah of Travancore was under considerable pecuniary embarrassments, lent him a sum of money, to enable him to fulfil certain engagements into which he had entered with the East-India Company. That loan, however, was made with the concurrence and assent of the then Governor General, and had subsequently, been sanctioned by succeeding Governors General. The loan also was made before the passing of the 37th of George 3rd, which prohibited all private loans to the native princes of India. Therefore, the transaction was entirely free from any imputation of illegality, the loan having been made in 1784, and that Act not having passed till 1797. Up to the year 1795, no portion of the nine lacs of rupees, which was the amount of Mr. Hutchinson's loan, had been repaid. In that year, however, the government of India paid to Mr. Hutchinson, four lacs out of certain balances that were due from them to the Rajah. This was clearly, sufficient to show that Mr. Hutchinson's debt had been recognized by the East India Company. In the year 1797, Mr. Hutchinson died, and shortly after the Rajah died too, being succeeded by his nephew. Under these circumstances, it became necessary, that an inquiry should be made into the conditions of the loan, in order that it might be seen whether it was advisable that the Rajah's territory should be taxed for its payment. For this purpose certain persons were appointed on behalf of the Rajah, and a gentleman was appointed on the part of Mr. Hutchinson's brother, in whom the property of the loan vested on the death of Mr. Hutchinson. These gentlemen reported that there remained due to Mr. Hutchinson 490,000 rupees—another corroboration of the correctness of the original loan of nine lacs. Between the year 1795 and 1800, a part of the debt, to nearly the amount of three lacs, was paid off; so that here was a third acknowledgment of the legality of the debt. In consequence of two lacs still being owing, Mr. Hutchinson sent a remonstrance to the Indian government, which induced the Marquis of Wellesley, then Governor General, to cause an inquiry to be made, the result of which was, that in 1804, the original debt was fully recognized, and it was stated that seven lacs, out of the nine, had been paid. This fully corresponded with Mr. Hutchinson's demand, and the Marquis of Wellesley consequently instructed the Resident at Travancore to assist Mr. Hutchinson in recovering the remainder. After this, no more difficulty was apprehended, but, it appeared, however, that the Company, by its private direction to the Resident, undermined the intentions of the Governor General, and Mr. Hutchinson sought in vain for his money from 1804 to 1806. In that year another inquiry took place, but again the Company interfered to prevent the payment. Lord Minto then took the matter up, but in September 1808, the Directors of the East-India Company wrote a letter, prohibiting the Rajah and and the Resident from recognizing the debt, by which a complete extinguisher was put on Mr. Hutchinson's claim. From the year 1809 to 1824, Mr. Hutchinson wearied the Company with letter on letter, application on application, and remonstrance on remonstrance, entreating them, at least, to explain why they objected to the order of their own Governor General. The Company's only answer, however, was, that they had not obtained a satisfactory account from Travancore; and yet during this very time, the revenues of Travancore were in the hands of the East-India Company, owing to the Rajah's tribute to them being in arrear. The revenue of Travancore amounted to thirty lacs a year; out of this the Company paid themselves, and set apart a portion for the maintenance of the young Rajah; after which there were twenty lacs remaining for the liquidation of the debts of the state; and yet, in spite of this, Mr. Hutchinson's claim still remained unpaid. In 1824 Mr. Hutchinson applied to the Board of Control, which made a report thereon; and the consequence was, that the Company sent a despatch to India, recommending that their own prohibitory edict of 1808 should be repealed, and that Mr. Hutchinson should be allowed to recover. The Company, however, took care to accompany this despatch with such instructions to their resident as rendered it impossible for Mr. Hutchinson to obtain payment; for in that despatch they spoke of his demand as a pretended debt, and forbade their Resident to afford any assistance. It was, therefore, not possible for Mr. Hutchinson to obtain justice on such instructions as those? It very naturally was convenient to the Rajah not to admit the debt; and there was a direct inducement held out to him to say, "I know nothing of it, except that it is a pretended debt, and entirely without foundation." These, were the short circumstances of the case; and, he thought they were fully borne out by the documents he held in his hand, and, he therefore, begged leave to move that they be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* said, he had last Session presented a petition from Mr. Hutchinson on the subject of this claim, and, he was, therefore, well able to say that the statement of the hon. and learned Member, was fully borne out by the facts of the case, as founded in documents which had been exhibited to him. It was also most important that the question should be taken into consideration without delay, as it rested in a great degree on the testimony of persons now living, but who were of a very great age, he, therefore, begged leave to second the Motion.

Sir *John Malcolm* said, he had no intention to oppose this petition, but he rose to protest against the mode in which it was desired to introduce it. He had little further knowledge of the merits of Mr. Hutchinson's claim, than what had been just now stated by the hon. and learned Member by whom the case was opened, and from that, there certainly appeared grounds for investigation; but the question was, should a claim from India, relative to a large money concern, which took place forty-seven years ago, between a Company's servant and the Rajah of Travancore, be sent to a Committee up stairs, without even the notice of the Indian minister, or any one responsible for the good administration of Indian affairs? A bill, not unlike the present, relative to a concern of more than fifty years' date (he alluded to the loan to the Rájah of Nozeed) was introduced in a similar manner to this House, and was now in progress through the House of Lords. If this course of proceeding was permitted, the House would have five hundred claims, of the same character to investigate, and the result might be as injurious to the finances as to the reputation of the Indian government. On this ground he entreated the attention of Ministers to the subject, and the proceedings were important, because the information in the hands of Government, connected with the Indian records could alone enable the House to judge whether a Committee should be granted or not. Without this, such Committees would be very incompetent to the task assigned them, and they could not have the means of deciding the merits of complicated concerns of such remote dates, and the items of which embraced such a variety of matter; nor, generally speaking, could they have that knowledge which was necessary to decide upon such questions. He did not impugn their desire to do justice; but the mode in which such petitions from a remote country like India, were investigated in a Committee, was not, in his opinion the best, for doing justice to both parties. In presenting such claims to the attention of the House, the person intrusted with them naturally tried to impress the House with a favourable opinion of their merits. In the present instance, it was asserted, by the hon. and learned Member, that Mr. Bury Hutchinson's loan to the Rajah was sanctioned, on its occurrence, by the Governor General, but he had seen no proof of that, and he had some reason to believe, that the first notice taken of it was by Mr. Duncan, the Governor of Bombay, eleven years after the money was said to have been advanced. What other authorities had sanctioned it, he had no means of knowing, but it was assumed that the Court of Directors had acted throughout in an unjust and oppressive manner, and, it was declared, they had carried on a private correspondence with the Resident at Travancore, which, if proved, amounted to a plot against the claimant. He never could believe, they had been guilty of such acts, although, he begged to state, that he was fully convinced the hon. and learned Member, considered himself authorized to make the statement from the documents which had been laid before him. The fact, however, could not be so, for the Residents at native courts, had no means of corresponding directly with the Court of Directors, all their communications went through the Governors of the different presidencies to which they were attached. Again the hon. and learned Member, had laid much stress upon the fact of the money having been lent before the 37th of George the 3rd which prohibited such transactions, but, it must be remembered, that the Company in the exercise of their sovereign authority in India, had directed their servants not to make loans to the native princes long before 1784, when this money was advanced.

Sir *Charles Forbes* said, that ever since he had first heard of this case, he had always thought, that, of all the cruel acts of the government of India, this was one of the worst. It so happened, that he had been in India from almost the very commencement of this transaction, or at least as far back as forty-three years; so that he might take it upon himself to say, that he knew something about the matter. It was quite true, that the loan made by Mr. Hutchinson to the Rajah was a benefit to the East-India Company; and the arrear of tribute was entirely owing to the Company's own conduct; for, in the first instance, they agreed to take the Rajah's subsidy in pepper; but when Buonaparte interfered with the trade of all Europe, the Company became frightened, and sent out orders that no more pepper should be taken, but money in its place. The Rajah's answer to this was, "I cannot pay in money, for I have none;" and thus a large arrear of subsidy became due, which ultimately led to the Company taking possession of his territory. With respect to what had fallen from his hon. and gallant friend, he should be extremely glad if Ministers would give themselves the trouble to look into this case; and he could affirm, moreover, that nothing was more desired by Mr. Hutchinson than that its merits should be sifted by competent men of business. His hon. and gallant friend did not make a very handsome argument for the Court of Directors, when he said, that nothing could be more inconvenient than for that House to give its sanction to the admission of such claims as this. Why, such a declaration might be set up by any man who refused to pay his just debts. But with respect to this particular case, he would venture to say, that there never was one which more strongly called for the interference of Parliament; for Mr. Hutchinson now had no other means by which he could obtain justice. It should be remembered also, that this Rajah was once an independent prince, and would still, probably, have continued so, if he had not unfortunately applied to the East-India Company for protection against Tippoo Sahib. The Company prevented that Sultan from devouring the Rajah, in order that they might feast upon him themselves. It was an actual fact, that, though they withdrew the troops granted for his protection, they refused to give up one single farthing of the subsidy. The revenues of Travancore amounted to forty lacs of rupees: the expenses of the State, including the subsidy, to thirty-seven; so that there were three lacs to spare, out of which Mr. Hutchinson might be paid. But, in addition to this, the debt was contracted before the Rajah's debt to the Indian government, and, therefore, it clearly had a claim to prior settlement. No doubt, as his hon. and gallant friend had observed, these claims were very inconvenient; and he remembered that Mr. Canning, when he thought that he was going out as Governor General, wanted to carry an Act in his pocket to bar all claims whatever. He (Sir Charles Forbes), however, would sit down, saying, that when a man could get redress no where else, it was the peculiar business of that House to afford it him.

Mr. *William Brougham* said, the hon. and gallant Officer had told the House, that if they entertained the case before them, it would open the door to many other applications of a similar character; he, therefore, wished to remark, that he had no doubt each case would be judged of according to its individual merits; and if another transaction as strong as the present should be introduced to their notice, all he could say was, he should be ready to advocate an inquiry into its circumstances.

Sir *John Malcolm* begged, in explanation, to be permitted to say, that he had never made use of the word "inconvenient," nor did at all wish to discourage individuals from prosecuting what they considered fair claims. As for his having not made a very good argument in favour of the Court of Directors, as alluded to by his hon. friend, the member for Malmesbury, all he meant to convey by his statement was, his anxiety to see justice done them, by having such claims properly investigated; and he must again express his surprise there was no Member connected with the Indian government present to take a part in the proceedings.

Mr. *Hume* said, he felt himself compelled to reiterate the complaint of the hon. and gallant Member. It was quite an anomaly in the proceedings of the House, that, when a petition of so much importance as this of Mr. Bury Hutchinson was brought forward, there should be no one on the part of Government competent to give any explanation. It certainly plainly showed, that one-half, at least, of the Members of the India Board might be dispensed with. He did not know whether there could be any objection to the present appointment of a Committee, and he should wish to be informed what was the intention of Government with respect to other petitioners who had similar claims to the one in question to bring forward?

Lord *Althorp* observed, that he was not aware that there could be any objection to the present Motion being agreed to. As to the question of his hon. friend, he could, at present, give no answer to it.

The Motion agreed to, and Committee appointed.

Exchequer Court (Scotland).] The Lord Advocate moved, that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Scotch Courts Compensation Bill.

Mr. *Goulburn* wished that the Committee might be deferred, as there were so few Members present to take a part in the proceedings.

Mr. *Dawson* objected to a Motion of so much importance as the present, which gave away a sum of 2,000*l.* per annum of the public money, being brought forward when the House was so thinly attended. He believed there were not more than twenty-two members then present, although there was a much greater number drawn from curiosity to an adjoining spot, and who, no doubt, would readily attend, on a message being sent to them from the Treasury benches. He deprecated this system of voting upon questions, without hearing any portion of the argument urged against them. He put it *ad verecundiam* to the shame and the sense of decency of the learned Lord, whether this measure for granting 2,000*l.* to Mr. Abercromby, out of the public money, after serving only two years as Chief Baron of the Exchequer—one of the grossest jobs which ever came before Parliament—was fit for discussion in such a House?

Mr. *Hume* concurred in all that had been said by the right hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House, with reference to the manner of voting; but he was surprised to hear that right hon. Gentleman complain of it, as it was no novelty: and he must have known that a similar reprehensible system prevailed when he was connected with the Treasury. At the same time, he could not but admire the new-born ardour of the right hon. Gentleman in the cause of economy. He (Mr. Hume) had formerly objected to the measure; but, after attending to the arguments addressed to the Committee, he was now equally ready to support it; and he hoped the learned Lord would go into his explanation, to show, to the satisfaction of the House and the country, that the measure would be beneficial to the public, without injuring the cause of justice. It might be a job, certainly, but it was to get rid of a much greater job of the Right hon. Gentleman, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his colleagues, who gave Mr. Abercromby 4,000*l.* per annum for life, for doing almost nothing.

Mr. *John Campbell:* So far from the country losing 2,000*l.* a-year, as the right hon. Gentleman, the member for Harwich (Mr. Dawson) seemed to insinuate, by this Bill, the fact was, the public would gain that sum, for Mr. Abercromby was at present receiving 4,000*l.* a-year.

Sir *Chares Forbes* said, he would take that opportunity to observe, that Government were bound, when they increased the duties of the Judges of the Court of Session, to make an increase in their salaries. The allowances to the English Judges had been increased, but the same justice was not dealt out to the Scotch. He was sure they performed equally as onerous duties; and he, therefore, exhorted the Scotch Members to stand up for their country, and not suffer the injustice to continue.

Mr. *Dawson* felt very much surprised at the course pursued by the hon. member for Middlesex, who had observed, that he had been convinced in the Committee, that the amount of 2,000*l.* a-year ought to be given to Mr. Abercromby. The proceedings in that Committee had had a very different effect upon him. But the question now was with respect to the propriety of voting money in so thin a House. In former days, the hon. Member would have made an immense outcry at the very proposition; but he appeared now to have overcome all his scruples, and was ready to support anything Ministers proposed. There might have been some excuse for such a course when the Reform Bill was in the House; but that measure had now passed, and it seemed to have carried the hon. Member's economy with it; for he was now earnest in upholding all the jobs of Government.

Mr. *Hume* said, it had already been shown to every hon. Member in the House, that this, at all events, was but a little job, rendered necessary by the great job of the right hon. Member and his friends. With regard to the reflections of the right hon. Member as to his conduct, considering the quarter from whence they proceeded, he trusted the House would not expect him to notice them.

Mr. *Dixon* said, after all, he thought the 2,000*l.* a-year might have been saved by appointing Mr. Abercromby to some other office; for a man of his distinguished talent was equal to any other duties in the public service.

The House in Committee.

The *Lord Advocate* said, he had listened with surprise to the objections made to this Bill:—First, that it was an extravagant and improvident waste of the public money; and secondly, that it was a job. With respect to the first, it was a grant which could not be made except on a contingency of saving at least double the amount; and as to its being a job, it was an extraordinary job which exchanged a sinecure salary of 4,000*l.* for a sinecure salary of 2,000*l.* The principle of the Bill was, that the Court of Exchequer in Scotland should be prospectively abolished, because there was no business in that Court; and if so, the House had a right to abolish it, but not to take away the salary of those who held offices in it for life. The Bill, therefore, made a tender of these annuities as a consideration for the voluntary surrender of the salaries, and thus effected an immediate reduction. When a superior Judge received a life-interest, was it consistent with justice to take that interest from him? All that the Legislature had ever presumed to do was, to declare it should not be renewed at the expiration of the existing life. If any Gentleman objected to the amount of the bribe, he might propose its reduction hereafter; but he believed many would think it not enough. It was perfectly within the power of the learned personages of the Court not to take the hint offered to them by the Bill, and refuse to retire: he (the Lord Advocate) should not blame them. How any person could consider this arrangement as an improvident grant of the public money, or as a job, which bought off 4,000*l.* by 2,000*l.*, he was at a loss to conceive. He looked upon it as a device skilfully contrived to economize the public money, and to accelerate the diminution of expenditure. The learned Lord then moved his Resolution for granting to the Lord Chief Baron the sum of 2,000*l.* per annum on the resignation of his office, 1,500*l.* to such of the two other Barons as should first retire, and 600*l.* to the Judge of the Court of Session, who should execute the duties of the Court of Exchequer, after their retirement.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that the learned Lord had defended this grant on the plea that Mr. Abercromby had been appointed to an office which had no duty attached to it. But the learned Lord and his colleagues had made no objection to that appointment; on the contrary, the present Lord Chancellor had declared that it was an appointment which did credit to the Government, and had applauded and approved it. But his (Mr. Goulburn's) objections were unanswered. It would have been better to transfer business to a Court that was little occupied, than to abolish it. But when the new Bankruptcy Court was established, why was not Mr. Abercromby appointed to the Chief Justiceship of that Court, which was placed on an equality with the other Judges, and which his experience as a Commissioner of Bankrupts, and as Chancery Barrister qualified him for? Instead of which, a pension of 2,000*l.* a-year was to be given to him, which was a real loss to the country. Notice of this was given to the Gentlemen opposite at the time; but, notwithstanding their great zeal for economy, they refused to listen to the argument.

Lord *Althorp* said, there was a question of much greater importance than the saving of 2,000*l.* in the appointment of a Judge, namely, whether the individual was qualified. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware, that when Mr. Abercromby was appointed Chief Baron, he asked whether it was intended to add any *Nisi Prius* business to the Court, because, if so, he was not competent to discharge its duties. Now, in the Bankruptcy Court, *Nisi Prius* business would come, and, therefore, by his own admission, Mr. Abercromby was not competent to preside in it. It had been said, that they (Ministers) had approved, when on the other side, of the appointment. Undoubtedly they thought it creditable to the Government to make such a selection. The present Bill would not preclude the appointment of Mr. Abercromby to any office for which he was competent, when his pension would merge in the salary. With regard to the hard terms which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dawson) had applied to this arrangement, he was so much in the habit of using strong terms, that they made but little impression. He could not see that the application of the term job, in its usual acceptation to this arrangement, was at all warranted; but, he supposed, in the right hon. Gentleman's understanding of it, it meant the saving to the public of 2,000*l.* a-year.

Mr. *Dawson* replied. The noble Lord opposite had attacked his (Mr. Dawson's) phraseology; but he begged to say he should continue to use, with respect to public matters, such language, whether strong or mild, as nature dictated to him. Mr. Abercromby had it not in his power to urge that he had left, two years ago, a lucrative profession to accept this office, and it would, therefore, have been but right for an economical Whig Administration, as they called themselves, to have put it to the honour and feeling of Mr. Abercromby to give up the salary as well as the pension. At least, if they wished to abolish the Court of Exchequer in Scotland, they might have appointed him to the then vacant office of Chief Commissioner of the Bankruptcy Court. He did not hesitate to say this proposed compensation was a job; and the defence used, that Mr. Abercromby could not fill the last-named office because he was not competent to charge a Jury, was a mere quibble, because the Court of Exchequer, in which he had presided, was also a Jury Court. The noble Lord at the head of his Majesty's Exchequer was perfectly callous to any proposition of retrenchment emanating from his side of the House: every suggestion emanating from that quarter he considered as originating in a faction. Mr. Abercromby was not more than fifty years of age, and, in the ordinary course of nature, might expect to hold his pension for twenty years. Here, therefore, was 40,000*l.* of the public money disposed of, exclusive of interest, for two years' service in the Court of Exchequer. He regretted he had not the talents of the First Lord of the Admiralty for calculations of this kind. He remembered when the right hon. Bart. moved for a return of the sums received by the Members of the Privy Council, how ingeniously he heaped sum upon sum; if he would but indulge in the same calculations upon this case, he had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman could show how much Mr. Abercromby had to receive for every time he put on his gown and wig at simple and compound interest. He had been accused of using strong language, but he had only followed the example of the right hon. Baronet, who had, upon that occasion, held up every Privy Councillor as a "bird of prey." He hoped Mr. Abercromby, by refusing the pension, would not allow such a name to be fixed upon him. After all, he had no scruple in repeating, that this was a job, as well as the Court of Bankruptcy itself, to which it was proposed to transfer Mr. Abercromby. He had opposed the establishment of that Court, and, therefore, he was glad to find its proceedings were about to come before the House, when an opportunity would be afforded to again discuss that subject.

Lord *Althorp*, in answer to the observation that the Government ought to have offered Mr. Abercromby another situation in the stead of that they sought to abolish, begged to say Mr. Abercromby was offered a situation much more lucrative than the proposed compensation, and which Mr. Abercromby refused.

Mr. *Goulburn* could easily imagine, that an individual who had filled a high judicial situation would not consent to accept a subordinate office, whatever might be the emoluments of that station. The Chief Commissionership of the Bankruptcy Court, one of equal rank with that from which he was to be removed, ought to have been offered to Mr. Abercromby.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* said, the only question before the Committee was, whether, in case it should be hereafter decided that the Court of Exchequer ought to be abolished, Mr. Abercromby should receive compensation. He would not enter now into any consideration of the propriety of abolishing his office; but, as Mr. Abercromby held it for life, and could not be removed from it but by his own default, the compensation of half his salary was not more than he could reasonably expect to obtain. As to this being a job, he did not see how the interest of Mr. Abercromby was advanced thereby. It was allowed he held an appointment which almost amounted to a sinecure, with 4,000*l.* a-year, and he gave it up for a pension of 2,000*l.* a-year; and, if it was indeed true, that the Court of Exchequer might be dispensed with, it was unfortunate that it was not discovered two years ago, when the Government appointed Mr. Abercromby to the office he now held. At the same time, he felt bound to say, that he thought the Government, relying upon the Report of the Committee of 1825, made the appointment, believing it would be useful to the public. He must take the opportunity to call the attention of the Committee to the present condition of the learned persons who filled the situation of Judges of the Supreme Court of Scotland. The salaries of these Judges had generally been raised when those of the Judges of England had been increased though not in so great a degree. In 1819, the salaries of the English Judges were increased; in 1820, so were those of the Scotch. The Act which so raised them recited, that it had been usual to raise the salaries of the Judges of the two countries at the same time; and so strong was the feeling of Parliament upon the subject, that it was provided in that Bill, that the increase in the salaries of the Scotch Judges should date back from the period when that of the English Judges took place. In 1825 the salaries of the English Judges were again raised, and the right hon. member for Tamworth, he trusted, would allow that it was in contemplation also to raise the salaries of the Scotch Judges, and that it was only delayed till certain alterations in the Scotch Court were effected. Two years afterwards, a Bill was brought in to regulate the business of the Court of Session, by which the number of Judges was reduced; subsequently its business was increased by the addition of that of the Consistorial and Admiralty Courts, which were suppressed; but the salaries of the Judges were not increased, although a Bill for that purpose was brought in. A period of five years had now elapsed, without justice having been done to those learned and meritorious individuals. He was certain, that, had the question related to the Judges of England, no such delay would have taken place. But the fact was, that the business of Scotland was not attended to in that House. The Judges of England had their salaries fixed, in 1825, at 5,500*l.* a-year, a sum which had been more recently reduced to 5,000*l.* He asked the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether it was unreasonable that the salaries of the Scotch Judges should be raised to half that sum? Their conduct had been most exemplary; for they had taken the additional duty thrown upon them with cheerfulness, and without offering a word about further remuneration; but surely that was only an additional reason to consider their case—he would not say with favour, for he wanted none—but with justice; and he trusted the noble Lord would give some intimation that it was his intention to render them justice. Such an intimation would give great satisfaction to all gentlemen of property in Scotland —to all interested in the administration of justice—to the whole people of that country. It should be recollected, that the emoluments which were made at the Bar, were far greater than those assigned to the Judges.

Sir *Robert Peel* had no hesitation in saying that, had he remained in office, pursuant to the pledge given by the late Government, he should have felt it his duty to bring before the House of Commons a proposition for the increase of the salaries of the Scotch Judges. Indeed, a proposition to that effect had been made, but was withdrawn in consequence of the opposition it met with from several hon. Members, and the late Government had not an opportunity of again bringing it forward before their removal from office. He certainly did think that 2,000*l.* a-year was not sufficient for the becoming maintenance of the judicial dignity in Scotland. The public were interested in the proper maintenance of these dignities, and that the proper forms of ceremony should be sustained, not to gratify personal vanity but to raise a proper respect for the high station. Whenever the proposition might be brought forward, it should have his warmest support. It was manifest that there was nothing like justice in granting a retiring Chief Baron, who had had nothing to do, 2,000*l.* per annum, and that 2,000*l.* was to be considered sufficient remuneration for a Judge actively discharging the high duties of his office.

Mr. *Hume* concurred in the sentiment that the Scotch Judges and their present condition were well deserving of the attention of the Government. But he thought if there was one class of men in England who were overpaid it was the Judges of the land; of whom the puisne Judges received more than the salary of the President of the United States of America, while the Chief Justice received upwards of 10,000*l.* per annum. These salaries ought to be decreased, and those of the Scotch Judges increased: for it was monstrous that a Master in Chancery should have above 3,000*l.* per annum, a Register of Deeds in Ireland 1,500*l.* per annum, while the Scotch Judges had but 2,000*l.* a-year.

Sir *Willam Rae* said, that he would never have introduced the measure which it had been his duty to promote two years ago, by which offices in Scotland to the amount of 22,000*l.* per annum were abolished, and the duties of the Scotch Judges increased, had it not been in the anticipation of the fulfilment of the pledge that they should be proportionably compensated. The proposed compensation toMr. Abercromby for the loss of a situation in which he had undoubtedly a vested right, he (Sir William Rae) should feel it his duty to support.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* said, the hon. member for Middlesex had compared the Judge's salaries with that of the President of the United States, and had said they were much over-paid. But the comparison was of no use, unless it was considered whether proper persons to perform the duties could be had for less money, and, he apprehended that was not the case even in England, and in Scotland it was notorious no first rate advocate would give up his practice at the Bar for the sake of a Judgeship.

Mr. *Strickland* said, that taking the relative population of England and Scotland the latter was not entitled to more than three Judges, in proportion to the number of people in both countries, whereas there was thirteen in the Court of Session, and three in the Court of Exchequer. Whenever therefore, they again heard of an increase of the salaries of the Scotch Judges, he hoped it would be taken as an earnest that their numbers were to be reduced.

Sir *George Clerk* said, that the duties imposed on the Judges of the Court of Session were as great as those imposed on the Judges of any other Court; and, considering the high station they filled, the salaries were inadequate to support these gentlemen with becoming dignity. In Scotland a general feeling prevailed that their salaries ought to be advanced in a similar proportion to that recently allowed to the English Judges.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he was heartily opposed to this sum of 2,000*l.* being taken out of the pockets of the people, who he was sure would be indignant at the attempt. He should, therefore, oppose the grant. It was a strange system of retrenchment, to give a sum of 2,000*l.* as a retiring allowance to a Judge who for two years had held a sinecure,while the active Judges only received the same sum. The people would think so, if it came to their knowledge, which he doubted, for he was certain a portion of the public Press would not publish much of that which fell from him and other hon. Members sitting on his side of the House. He would move that the amount of the proposed compensation should be reduced form 2,000*l.* to 1,000*l.*

Mr. *John Campbell* had heard no argument used against the Resolution before the House. Mr. Abercromby had consented to receive half the salary as a retiring compensation, and he saw no reason to object to it, particularly when Mr. Jervis, Mr. Cashberd, and the other Welsh Judges had received the full retiring allowance.

The *Attorney General* considered that no reasonable objection had been or could be offered to the Resolution before the House. He must corroborate the statement of his hon. and learned friend who had just spoken with respect to the Welsh Judges, and he begged to mention two exceptions only, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Serjeant Goulburn, who had not received the retiring allowance, because both those gentlemen had accepted the office after it was in contemplation to abolish the Welsh Judgeships, a fact which was communicated to them, and also that they would not be entitled to retiring compensation. In addition to the offer of the situation of

Accountant General of the Court of Chancery, alluded to by the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a communication had taken place with respect to the Court of Bankruptcy, which was declined by Mr. Abercromby, who alleged he did not feel himself competent to discharge the duties of a Jury Court.

The Resolutions agreed to, the House resumed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Wednesday, April 11, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Earl of RADNOR, from Walsall, in favour of the Reform Bill:—By Lord WYNFORD, from the Non-Resident Freemen of Sudbury, against the Bill:—By the Earl of RODEN, from the Presbytery of Tain, against the proposed Plan of Education for Ireland.

REFORM. PETITIONS.] The Earl of *Roden* said, that he had a Petition to present, to which he begged the attention of their Lordships. It was from the reverend Sir Harcourt Lees, of Black Rock, in the county of Dublin, against the Reform Bill now on their Lordships' Table. The character of the petitioner was well known to many of their Lordships, and, perhaps, though there might be some who did not think the opinions of the reverend Baronet entitled to much weight, those amongst them who had the best opportunities of knowing that reverend gentleman would think differently. The petition was rather strongly worded, but he believed it contained nothing disrespectful to their Lordships, and, therefore, he had considered it his duty to present it. He would also beg leave to recapitulate a few of its leading points. The petition stated, that it was the opinion of the petitioner, that if, in an evil hour, the Bill now on their Lordships' Table should unfortunately pass into a law, it would at the next election have the effect of sending, not a body of men who could be called the Representatives of the people, but a set of English Jacobin radicals, and of Irish Popish Reformers—a set of men who, probably with little property, and less principle, would pay little regard to the best parts of our Constitution. The petition went on to say, that, on behalf of her Royal Highness the Princess Victoria, daughter of the late Duke of Kent, and presumptive heir to the throne of these realms, he deprecated a measure which would endanger her succession to the throne, which it was and ever had been, the great object of the radical and revolutionary Reformers to destroy. The petitioner also deprecated the Reform Bill as a measure which would have the effect of destroying the Protestant Church, sweeping away the Peerage, destroying the Monarchy, creating a temporary Republic, and ending at length in anarchy and massacre. He (the Earl of Roden) was aware that there were many of their Lordships who were disposed to attach little weight to any opinions of the reverend gentleman from whom this petition came, but though he had several eccentricities, he was a shrewd and intelligent observer of passing events, and it was certain that most of the results which he had predicted would flow from Catholic Emancipation had come to pass exactly as he had foretold them. He now moved that the petition do lie on the Table.

Lord *Teynham* thought that such a petition was an insult to their Lordships, and he would move that it be rejected.

The Duke of *Sussex* said, that he would be satisfied with whatever might be the decision of their Lordships on this motion; at the same time he must express his surprise that any noble Lord could be found to present such a petition. He must most strongly deprecate the use of such language, on the part of any person coming as a petitioner before that House, as had been made use of by this person. It was an insult to their Lordships to say that those who were the supporters of the Reform Bill were enemies to the succession of her Royal Highness the daughter of the Duke of Kent. Such language was an outrage on the feelings of many of their Lordships, which ought not to be tolerated.

Lord *Ellenborough* moved that the petition be read at length by the clerk at the Table.

The petition having been read,

The Earl of *Roden* would now appeal to the illustrious Duke (Sussex) whether in what he had just heard read there was any imputation whatever against the supporters of the Bill in that House. What was stated was only the opinion of the petitioner as to the views and objects of some Reformers, and as a British subject he had as much right to state his opinions as the illustrious Duke, or any other subject of the realm.

Earl *Grey* said, he was not at all surprised that the illustrious Duke should think it strange that a petition containing such expressions as they had just heard should be presented to their Lordships. He, of course, must deprecate the use of such terms as were contained in the petition, but whatever absurdity, bordering even on insanity, the petitioner had indulged in, in stating his opinions to the House, he thought that was no ground for rejecting the petition. The sentiments put forth were the opinions of the petitioner. Those opinions might be right or wrong, but however absurd — however they might border on insanity—still as the petition was, as far as their Lordships were concerned, couched in respectful terms, it ought not to be rejected. The petitioner did not impute to their Lordships any design of cutting off the succession of the Princess Victoria, but it applied altogether to persons not in either House of Parliament whom the petitioner characterized as revolutionists and demagogues. He hoped these assertions with respect to any part of the people were incorrect, but whether they were or not, nothing offensive, in his opinion, was stated with regard to the House. Whatever might be his opinion as to not rejecting the petition when once presented, he must say, that, if such a petition had been offered to him for presentation to their Lordships he would at once have declined to present it.

Lord *Teynham* said, that, after what had fallen from the noble Earl (Grey), he would not press his motion for the rejection of the petition, though he fully concurred with the noble Earl, that, had such a petition been offered to him to present, he would have declined to do so.

Petition to lie on the Table.

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second Reading—Third Day.] The Order of the Day for resuming the Debate on the Reform Bill read.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* begged to claim the indulgence of their Lordships for a short time, as he could not allow the debate to close on so important a question without stating the grounds on which he meant to give his vote against the second reading of this Bill. Widely as their Lordships might differ on this important measure—widely as they might differ as to the necessity, expediency, and sound policy, of passing it—widely as they might differ on the ulterior benefits or evils which in the event of the Bill passing, would result from its making such great changes in the Representation of the people, still he felt convinced that they were unanimously agreed in the opinions that the speedy and final settlement of the question was in every respect desirable, if for no other purpose than to allay that spirit of agitation which had been excited in the country—which had led to the invasion of the public peace and tranquillity—which had caused the loss of life in more than one direction, and the consequences of which would, he feared, be felt to the last hour. Of all the political questions which could be brought before the people of England, this, above all others, should be discussed with calmness, temper, and deliberation. It was particularly incumbent on his Majesty's Ministers to have approached the subject with all the prudence in their power, and they were bound to caution every person, over whom it could be supposed that they possessed an influence, against taking any steps to inflame the passions of the people. He regretted to find that sufficient care had not been used in that respect, the more particularly as it was evident there was no occasion to use illegal or unconstitutional means for awaking the notice of the people; for in whatever shape so important a question as that of a Reform of the Representation was brought forward, it must have commanded public attention, even on no better grounds than that nine-tenths of the community would imagine that it held out immediate or prospective benefits to them. At the time the question was brought forward, the situation and circumstances of the country gave it a much more important character than perhaps attended the introduction of any measure which he could recollect in the history of the State. He would not detain the House by proving that the agricultural and manufacturing interests were suffering great distress when the noble Earl first made mention of the Bill, nor would he detain it to inquire into the true causes to which that suffering was to be referred. Sufficient for him was it to state, that a degree of suffering almost unexampled existed at that time, the greater part of which could be traced to, in his opinion, the consequences of the change which took place at the close of that war which, by a noble Earl last night, was loaded with every opprobrious term—but to which he considered we were indebted for our political existence, and the security of those principles that produced the greatness, the wealth, and the glory of the State. He would not stop to inquire whether that suffering was attributable to the changes which had taken place in the currency of the country; nor would he say, that it arose from the mistaken and false theories of those political economists who had encouraged foreign manufacturers to the exclusion and ruin of our own. He would not dwell any longer upon that subject, or examine at greater length what the causes of that distress were. It was sufficient for his purpose to state, what no one could deny, that the moment chosen for the introduction of this Bill was one of almost unexampled suffering and alarm. It was, therefore, natural to expect that those persons who found their affairs involved in difficulties, and ruin staring them in the face, would fly to any new proposition which contemplated extensive change, in the hope that they might secure relief, and an amendment of their situation. For that reason he found that the announcement of Reform was hailed with acclamation. He had personally inquired among various classes of the community, and he found in all, that the wildest hopes of benefit were indulged. The agriculturist expected relief from the burthens which weighed upon the land, and from the commercial restrictions which interfered with the price of his produce—the landholder promised himself that his income would be increased tenfold, and that all the taxes on the necessaries of life would be removed—the manufacturer believed that new protecting duties would be enforced—in short, not a single branch of trade, agriculture, or manufacture, but imagined that new health was to be infused into the system, and that all in future was to be prosperity and happiness. The decision of their Lordships last Session put to flight, for a time, all those poetical imaginations. However much that decision disappointed others, he was one of those who truly rejoiced at it; and whatever might be the result of the debate on this occasion, he never could repine that the Reform Bill of last year was lost. He rejoiced at it on many grounds; and if for no better reason, that it gave the reflective and constitutional part of the country time to think on what had been done—on the true purport of the measure that was proposed to them, and to consider if there were evils in the Representation whether it was prudent thus sweepingly to redress them. These were his sincere opinions, and he hoped he should not again be exposed to the charge of inconsistency which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack brought against him in his speech in October last. He felt that he was not open to such an accusation. He admired consistency as much as any man, but he took a distinction, which he thought all their Lordships would join him in, between true consistency and that subserviency which was often mistaken for it. He could not value any man who did not preserve consistency in his public life, but he took care to try the person charged with the breach of it by the true test of principle, and by the spirit of the acts which he offered to support. He maintained, on the subject of Reform, that the vote he was about to give was not inconsistent with any act of his life. He was as much a Reformer now as he had been at any former period. He was ready to support it to the fullest and greatest extent which he had at any time been favourable to, but he held that he was not bound to agree to all and every measure that was brought forward under that name. With regard to this Bill, he was opposed to it as a whole, but he confessed that he could see no objection to the granting Members to those towns that had grown up to opulence and extent since the Representation was settled. He was as friendly as any noble Lord to the proposition for giving every right enjoyed by one town to others of equal importance, but he saw no reason in order to secure that advantage to large places, to sweep away the vested rights and ancient franchise of boroughs because they were of small extent. He felt that the extension of the rights of Representatives could not be denied to large and opulent towns; but he, for one, would never agree to the destruction of the franchise of various places whose privileges were founded on usage and justice. The Bill introduced by the noble Earl was founded on three principles—namely, disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and the extension of the qualification of voting. He thought that the manner in which the principle of enfranchisement was carried into effect, though proper in the main, was in some cases most objectionable. For instance, the plan of increasing the metropolitan Members he could never agree to, and he had not failed to inform the noble Earl of his decided objection to that part of the Bill. It was a plan calculated to create great alarm in the country at large, inasmuch as it gave a preponderance to a place where clamour had so many means of working out its ends, and it was also calculated to injure the other commercial interests of the country. With respect to the principle of disfranchisement, he could not understand why it should have been introduced at all. Surely it was not necessary, because Representatives were given to a few large towns, that the rights of boroughs should be swept away, which were as ancient as many of their Lordships' titles, and might yet be advanced to prosperity and relative importance in the country. He thought that a more judicious plan might easily be adopted with regard to the smallest boroughs, against whom the wrath of the noble Lords and the Reformers in general was specially directed—namely, enlarging the boroughs by adding the surrounding parishes to them. With regard to the third principle, which altered the qualification of voting, he had the greatest objection to a constituency founded on one general uniform money qualification, but if such a one were adopted he thought that at least the qualification should have been raised to 20*l.* If the clause passed in its present state, the wealth and property of the country would not have a fair influence in the elections. He even considered that this point was more objectionable in the present than in the former Bill, for in the preceding case the voter was obliged to pay 10*l.* a-year rent, but by this Bill, he need not pay a shilling rent, and his right depended on the assessment and payment of the taxes. Could any plan be more easily devised to admit the manufacturing of votes? Any person who employed a number of workmen might call them together, and say he would give them so much wages and house room, reserving an allowance for rent to give the required qualification. If the plan was suffered to work uninterrupted for some years, he was quite certain that the House of Lords, as well as the Monarchy, would sink under the effects of such a constituency. These were the leading and principal features of the Bill, to which he could never give his assent, though he was prepared to allow the manufacturing towns their fair share in Representation, and to transfer the influence which had fallen into the hands of individuals, who had become possessed of the smaller boroughs to the property of the country. He was not like some of their Lordships, to be affected in property or influence by the Bill. He possessed no borough influence—he took care not to seek influence over any man, and he allowed all those over whom it might be supposed that he had some control to pursue what line of politics they pleased. He, therefore, felt no alarm on his own account, and consequently he, as independently as any noble Lord in the House, took his stand against the Bill on its demerits, and implored them not to pass it into a law, as the ruin of two estates in the realm, that House and the Throne, would in his opinion be the inevitable consequence. With regard to the distinctions which those noble Lords who voted against the measure last year, and were now prepared to support the second reading, took between both Bills, he protested that he could see no difference to justify in his mind, the course they had taken. One of those noble personages pointed out a variety of instances in which the present measure was superior to the last; and the other contended that the House was bound to yield to what he called public opinion, but which he (the Earl of Winchilsea), more aptly termed popular clamour. He wished to ask that noble Baron if that was the position in which he really wished to place the House? Did that noble Baron ask him, one of the legislators of the greatest country in the world, to surrender his judgment to the dictates of a crowd, and to yield up his reason and his sense of right to the demand of public clamour? Here he could not avoid alluding to the use that had been made of the Royal name; and the friends of the Bill were not justified in saying that his Majesty was taking a part which in his opinion almost involved a breach of that oath which he had taken to preserve inviolate the Constitution, or that he was about to force this measure through the House by making an unwarrantable use of one of the prerogatives of the Crown. He trusted that these rumours were false. He believed that the Monarch of a free people was true to himself and to the country; and he was convinced that their Lordships would continue to act with the same determination which they had already evinced. They must feel that their independence was at stake, and they ought to declare that they would not be the only slaves in a free country. He, therefore, discarded all the idle rumours of the day, and implored their Lordships to stand by the helm of the State, and not to trust themselves in the frail bark in which the noble Earl proposed to embark the new Constitution. He asked them to consider what kind of vessel they should have to step into, by whom was it to be manned, by whom was the helm to be held, and who was to ensure to them a safe or an honourable voyage? He was prepared if necessary to go down with the present vessel of the Constitution; to do his duty honestly and fearlessly, and to lose every thing but his honour, in his efforts to preserve it. These were the considerations which occurred to him when this great and important change in the Constitution was proposed for his adoption or rejection. He had no difficulty in determining the question for himself, and he implored their Lordships to rally with him round that old and venerated standard which had enabled the country to conquer in so many battles—had led it to a height of prosperity, and made it the envy and admiration of the whole world. Under that standard too, we had been enabled to put down that democratic spirit which was wafted to our shores from infidel France, and which, if suffered to work its way, would have involved the general civilization of the world in a common ruin. There were, he considered, with reference to this Bill four parties in the country—the first composed of those who adhered, with perhaps too scrupulous a fidelity, to the form as well as the substance of the Constitution as it existed at present; the second, that constitutional party who were disposed to grant Representation to large commercial and manufacturing towns, but who carefully abstained from touching the property of others, or the rights of any franchise; the third, the Roman Catholic party, who were labouring for the advancement of their Church and the injury of the Protestant establishment; and the fourth, that revolutionary party who had been at work for years, and who sought to produce the same confusion in this country which those who were actuated by an equal spirit had already effected in France and Belgium, and would gladly spread from one part of Europe to the other. Among the variety of shades of which this party was composed the Whigs were conspicuous. Their object was, by means of this heterogeneous mass of democracy to keep their opponents the Tories out of power, and thereby put an end to their political existence. The property and intellect of the country would be if not totally unrepresented yet completely overwhelmed, for it was among the intellectual, moral, and richer orders of the country, that the strength of the Tory party lay. He implored their Lordships, by the duty which they owed to their country—that country which looked up to them for the faithful discharge of those high functions which were intrusted to them—not to be misled—not to suffer themselves to be swayed by any considerations which would impede that faithful discharge of those duties. For himself, he could only say, that he should give his most decided opposition to the measure, for he felt that the most objectionable parts of the former one were by no means removed in the present Reform Bill; and in giving that opposition he did it upon the most conscientious motives.

The Duke of *Buckingham* said, that he had heard with great regret, as well as with great surprise, the language held in defence of the votes which they meant to give on the present occasion by three noble Lords, whose example he was so proud to imitate, and whose lead he was so happy to follow, on the last debate which their Lordships had on this subject. Those noble Lords then led the array of their Lordships who were opposed to the present measure, on to victory. He regretted to find them now on the opposite side of the contest. They stood in a painful and unfortunate situation. They had each made unanswered and unanswerable speeches, and they had all been put, on the present occasion, to the unpleasant necessity of endeavouring to answer themselves. Inasmuch as they had led to victory before their Lordships were prepared to fight again under their standard, trusting to the same patriotism, and having confidence in the same soundness of argument and fervour of eloquence, which had formerly distinguished them. But when the opposing parties were drawn up in battle array against each other, and the conflict was on the point of commencing, these noble personages

"——Back recoil'd, they knew not why,
Even at the sounds themselves had made."

These noble personages declared that they were not deserters from any standards, because they had never listed under them. He would give them all the credit that was due to such an apology; but he must remind them, that if they were not listed soldiers in the camp, they served in it as volunteers and amateurs. They had now gone over in the same capacity to the other side. He hoped that they would not find themselves, as amateurs generally did, in the way of those whom they incumbered with their support, and that they would not be shot down by their own soldiery. It pleased the noble Earl who had spoken last night, to be facetious upon the noble Marquis who sat near him (the Marquis of Londonderry). He had said, that he had no objection to fight in any army under the command of his noble friend, provided his right wing was not commanded by the Bailiff of Old Sarum, and his left wing was not led on by the Mayor of Gatton. Now, he begged leave to remind the noble Earl, that there was one still more disgraceful flag now in the field—the flag of the Political Union of Birmingham—and under that flag the noble Earl and his two distinguished friends were now fighting. But if there were as many flags in the field as were placed before Major Dalgetty in the novel, for his selection, the flag of Mr. Attwood was the last under which he should choose to fight. The noble Earl had told them that his objections were to the principles of the last Bill. Might he be permitted to ask the noble Earl whether he had no objections to the principles of the present? There was not one of the arguments which the noble Earl and his two distinguished friends had directed against the last Bill, conscientiously he had no doubt, that did not apply equally to the present. They had voted against the last Bill on account of its democratic tendency; and on that account their Lordships had thrown it out. The noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had then said, that he would bring in another Bill of similar efficiency, and that if he could not carry it, he would not remain an hour in the counsel of his Sovereign. The noble Earl had kept his promise: he had presented them with a Bill of equal efficiency, and the real question then before their Lordships was, whether the consistency of that House was to be destroyed, in order that the consistency of the noble Earl might be preserved? What, he would ask, was the difference in principle between this Bill and the last? Was this Bill less democratical than the last? The noble Earl objected to the Bill of last year because it was too democratical. Was this Bill, he would ask, less democratical? The noble Earl said to them on the former occasion —"If you will not believe Mr. Attwood as to the democratical tendency of this Bill, whom will you believe?" On the present occasion the Political Union of Birmingham had declared that this Bill was more democratical than the last, and would answer their purposes better. Would the noble Earl advise their Lordships to give no credence this year to the evidence which last year he had declared to be most positive and irrefragable? The noble Earl had said, that the Bill of last year was called for by the people; and the noble Baron who spoke last night, and the noble Earl from Scotland (the Earl of Haddington) had both declared that their Lordships had been placed in a false situation by their vote last year upon it. And yet who was it but the noble Earl who had incited them to reject that Bill, by asking them whether the debates in that House were to be a mere mockery, and the House itself a mere chamber to register the orders of the House of Commons, and the clamours of the people? If the present Bill were not less democratical than the last, how came it to pass that the noble Earl was going to vote for it? The noble Earl last year told them not to submit to intimidation, but to despise it. He called on the noble Earl this year to abide by his own words, or to explain to their Lordships why they were now to submit to intimidation. Another noble Earl had told them that the country was quiet and tranquil. Witness the meetings at Birmingham, and the scenes at Bristol, Nottingham, and Derby, at all which places there had been formidable riots, all commenced and carried on in the name of Reform. But if the noble Earl had met, in the course of his rambles, any Minister so blind to the wants of the people, so deaf to their complaints, and so full of personal ambition, as to think that all obstacles should give way before his gratification of it—if he had met any Minister, who, forgetting the respect due to the authority of his Sovereign, had said, "You must vote for the second reading of this Bill, for if you do not, I shall exercise the power to create Peers, which I have derived from the highest authority"—if he had met any Minister employing such language to him, he was sure that he knew what answer the noble Earl would have given to him. His answer would have been this: "My Lord, you may commit an impeachable act—you may sacrifice the Constitution of your country—you may send your name down to posterity blackened by such an act: but we, the Peers of England, will do our duty—we will stand between the living and the dead, and, by the blessing of God, we will stay the plague." Such, he well knew, would have been the answer of the noble Earl. But, said the noble Earl, "There has been no compromise between me and the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government." He was sure, from the honourable character of both parties, that there had been no compromise; but had there been no endeavour to soften down the Bill? and if there had been such an endeavour, had it succeeded in softening down the noble Earl in a single point? Had the noble Lords succeeded in taking a single point from the democratical part of the Bill? If they had not, how could they expect that the Opposition would succeed better in public in the Committee, than their Lordships had in private with the noble Earl, when they were fondly solacing him with promises of support? But the noble Lords had been admitted behind the scenes, and had seen the incantation going on. Like Macbeth, they had broken in upon the witches, exclaiming, with him,

> "How now, you secret, black, and midnight hags!
> What is't you do?"

To which the reply given to the noble Lords was,

> "A deed without a name."

They had been witnesses to the incantations pronounced over the cauldron; they saw the spell formed by which it was intended to

> "——Untie the winds, and let them fight
> Against the churches—to let the yesty waves
> Confound and swallow navigation up;"

> "—— Castles topple on their warders' heads:
> And palaces and pyramids to slope
> Their heads to their foundations."

They saw the cauldron mixed, the ingredients poured in, and the charm completed; and then they said, "When it begins to boil, we will take the venom out of the cauldron." Did the noble Earl fancy that "when the charm was fast and good," he would be allowed to skim off the venom as he proposed?—to take away the

> "Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
> Wool of bat, and tongue of dog;"

or,

> "Liver of blaspheming Jew."

Could they expect to extract the venom out of a cauldron that contained nothing but venom. Did the noble Lord fancy that he could make anything either edible or potable out of such a "Hell broth?" No: if they consented to read this Bill a second time, their Lordships must prepare themselves to see revolution taking its usual course—that course which it had always hitherto taken both in this country and in France. He would not recur to the thrice-told tale of the French Revolution; but he would advise their Lordships to ponder on what had happened in this country during the time of Charles 1st. What was then the first thing done? The House of Commons passed a Triennial Bill, and they got the consent of Charles 1st to it. Charles was then a patriot King—nay, more, a citizen King. But what followed? The very next year the Commons took his Ministers from him, and compelled him to subscribe to a judicial murder. What came next? The Commons deprived the Bishops of their seats in Parliament, and passed Resolutions declaring that they were the only body entitled to direct the affairs of the kingdom. Then there was only one Chamber, and the privileges of the House of Peers were for some years suspended; the Monarch was dethroned; and a Republic established. Such had been the march of events formerly—such would it be again, if this Bill were unfortunately passed into a law. A noble relation of his, whom he dearly loved, though they differed widely on most political subjects, had lately published a life of Hampden which did him much credit. In that work his noble relation had given an anecdote of Hampden, which rested, he believed, on very good authority. He represented Hampden to have said to some Members of the House of Commons, who, at an early period of that revolution, were ridiculing the purple nose and vulgar figure of Cromwell, "Never you mind; if we break with the

King, in his hands will the destinies of England be placed." From that expression his noble brother had drawn a conclusion respecting the acute penetration of Hampden in which he (the Duke of Buckingham) thought he was not altogether justified. He (the Duke of Buckingham) believed that all that Hampden then meant—for, be it observed, Hampden was no revolutionist, and Cromwell at that time had made no figure either in the field, the Parliament, or the Cabinet—he believed that all that Hampden then meant was this:—"Break with the King, and it is in such hands as Cromwell's that the destiny of the country will be placed." "So will it be now," continued the noble Duke, "if we break with the King, it will be in the hands of sullen Radicals, of domestic tyrants, of canting Puritans, or of some ascetic Statesman, who retires now because his plots are not ripe, and spins his web until the country is fixed in his toils, that the destinies of England will be placed." In those days the noble Earl now at the head of the Treasury, who would never be suffered to direct the storm he had raised, would be told—"We have made use of your high mind—we have made a stepping-stone of you—and have now done with you—hereafter we shall follow our own course." Did not the noble Earl feel himself almost in that situation at present? Did he not feel that he was now touching ground—that the waters were retiring from him, and that as they retired, they would leave him at the mercy of the birds and beasts of prey that were even now hovering round him. The noble Earl, in his speech of a former night, had expressed a hope that if this Bill should be unfortunate in its results, he might be the only person involved in the ruin which it might create. But that could not be. All their Lordships would be included in it; and where, then, would he be who had first permitted the waters of destruction to rush in upon them. But the noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby) thought that this Bill would be more favourable in its principles to his views than the last. He should like to know what part of the Bill was more favourable to them, and what principles were contained in it? The principles of the Bill of last year was enfranchising without necessity, and disfranchising without trial. Were not the principles of this Bill the same? In what respect did they differ? In this Bill the county Representation would be swamped by the town voters. [Earl *Grey* here said, "*No;* the freeholders in towns returning Members will not be voters for the county, except those under 10*l.* annual value."] He did not object to be set right upon this point, because there were still too many objectionable parts in the Bill for him to enter into. He presumed the noble Earl was correct; but still the effect of this provision would be to place that power which was mainly exercised by rural freeholders at present, in the hands of the populace of towns. With respect to the nomination boroughs, the noble Earl and the noble Lord who addressed them last night had, for the first time, discovered that these boroughs ought to be abolished. But he never would concede to these noble Lords that they possessed the right to take from the inhabitants of the nomination boroughs the elective franchise, and the privilege of voting. He had no hesitation in acknowledging that he himself held influence in them; he held it by the law, and to the law he would restore it. Why was the nomination-borough system objectionable? Certainly not because the inhabitants had the right of voting for Members of Parliament, but because the control of that right had got into the hands of individuals. Why, then, punish those boroughs for the fault of others? He would mention the case of a nomination borough with which he was connected. It was composed of persons of the very poorest class—men who had never seen five guineas of their own, at one time, in their pockets; and yet the price of a seat had never stained their hands. Twice had attempts been made to bribe them—and once by a zealous Reformer. Upon those occasions they came to him (the noble Duke), and informed him of the offers which had been made to them, and asked him for his advice. All that they received from him in return was his thanks for their attachment, and his advice that they should continue to resist the attempts made to corrupt them. Now, let him ask the framers and the supporters of this Bill, what right they had to disfranchise these men? What right had all the 10*l.* householders, from Whitechapel to Whitehall, from Limehouse to Lambeth, to hold up their Pharisaical heads and say, "Thank God, I am not as one of these?" Was Aylesford, Cricklade, and Shoreham disfranchised when they were convicted of gross crimes? No: the recurrence of the evil in these cases was prevented by the infusion of purer blood into their veins. Why, then, were people to be disfranchised who had committed no offence, for no other reason but the arbitrary will of the noble Earl, and for the sole purpose, as it appeared, of increasing the influence of the democracy in large towns? The measure which he should have the honour to propose to their Lordships, if this Bill was rejected, should never take from such men the rights they enjoyed by the law, and which they had never abused. He would take that opportunity of saying, with regard to the notice he had given, that it might have occurred to many of their Lordships, as it had undoubtedly to him, that any measure of this description ought to originate in the House of Commons. If the House thought so, he should embody his measure in the shape of Resolutions, and leave it to the House of Commons to bring in a Bill in their spirit. The noble Earl had informed them that the excellence of his Bill consisted in its principle. The assumed principle was population and taxation; the admissibility of which, at the best, was doubtful, but in point of fact there was no such principle in the measure. Indeed, an attempt had been made to establish a principle, but, on examination, it would be found that in no two clauses of the Bill had it been adhered to. He would refer their Lordships to several cases to prove this. In the case of Dartmouth, it had been decided, that one Member should be taken from it; and the pretence had been, because it did not pay to the Crown a sufficient sum in assessed taxes to come up to the arithmetical figure in the scale of Lieutenant Drummond, that was necessary to remove it out of schedule B. It was contended, however, that sufficient money was paid; but that the collector intercepted it *in transitu*, under cover of a false assessment, to which he procured the signature of the Commissioners. But how stood the case with Helston? That borough was fully rated in the assessment signed by the Commissioners of Taxes, but it happened that a corps of yeomanry cavalry was raised by the inhabitants. The parties owning the horses in the corps claimed an exemption from taxes, which was allowed while their horses were used. The Government availed themselves of this, and hence it arose—while Dartmouth was put into schedule B, because, by means of a false assessment, the money paid by its inhabitants did not reach the Treasury—Helston was also inserted in the same schedule, because its assessment was right, but persons had a power to claim a temporary exemption; and, availing themselves of it, did not pay the necessary amount. So that whether the assessment was right or wrong, it mattered not; an excuse was equally found to put those devoted places in schedule B. As to the injustice of comparing one place with another:—referring to the Parliamentary Returns of "Customs and Shipping," it appeared, that the port of Dartmouth stood, in amount of registered tonnage, 24,850; being the eleventh in quantity in England, and fifth as to Scotland —the third as to Ireland, and the first as to Wales; or, in other words, that there were but sixteen ports in the United Kingdom which stood above it in this respect. By a further reference to the same document it would be found, that there were at least thirty-four boroughs in England only, which were to be represented by sixty-eight Members, not one of which was equal in extent to Dartmouth. Indeed, so far were they below it, that, on striking an average of the thirty-four ports, their tonnage would be found to amount only to 6,801 tons each. Whilst one member, therefore, was to represent 24,850 tons of registered shipping, each of the other sixty-eight Members would, on an average, represent only 3,400. In examining, also, the test of 10*l.* houses creating the Representation, the same injustice would be found. By a paper, dated the 5th of March, it appeared that Dartmouth had 422 10*l.* houses; while there were thirty-six boroughs with two Members each, with less than 422—they having, on the average, only 350 houses to each borough. So that, whilst one Member for Dartmouth would have the inhabitants of 422 houses to elect him, each of the seventy-two Members of the other thirty-six boroughs, if the election were single, would have only 175. With regard to enlarging constituencies, and destroying nomination or property boroughs, these circumstances amongst others occurred in the same county. Honiton, by the before-mentioned Return, would have as voters the inhabitants of 310 10*l.* houses. It had now 700 or 800 voters: so much for enlarging constituencies! As to nomination boroughs, take Totness and Dartmouth as instances.

Totness was once a nomination borough in the hands of the Bolton family; it had been for some years perfectly independent of any such command of property. The Commissioners went down, and finding a bridge there leading to a town, they added Bridgetown to the parish of Totness. Bridgetown was the property of a noble Duke, who had been buying largely on the Totness side also. The consequences were fully understood in that borough; no one doubted the result. The Commissioners also visited Dartmouth—added to the town the whole parish of Townstall, which was the property of one gentleman: the result was as obvious as at Totness. The noble Lord, the Paymaster of the Forces, who had taken so active a part in the discussion in another place, being asked why, since the Commissioners had taken in Bridgetown to Totness, they did not also take into Dartmouth the place that was opposite to that borough, and on the same river as Totness and Bridgetown—answered, because there was not a bridge at Dartmouth, but simply a ferry. With regard to Representation up to this time, Dartmouth had been totally independent of any property-influence whatever. These, then, were the principles of the Bill; and this was the manner they were adhered to—and, if their Lordships would take the trouble to go through the whole Bill, they would find multiplied instances of similar anomalies. He now came to the boundaries of boroughs, on which he wished to say a few words; and there again he found that a sort of friendly care had been taken of particular interests. Let their Lordships just examine how the borough of Calne was treated. There the yellow line was favourable to the noble Marquis, the President of the Council. A barn was included in a singular manner, and the line circling a barren field thereby hooked into the borough the Lodge at the approach to Bowood. [The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, the building mentioned had no vote.] The noble Marquis said the building gave no vote. Then why was so much pains taken to encircle it? Would it not allow a vote to be created in future? These were things which it was impossible not to observe, on looking at the details of the measure. So many instances of good fortune never occurred before. They looked as if produced by some regular and active system. Noble Lords opposite talked much of the principles of the Bill, and of adhering to them; but to him it seemed that the great operative scheme of the measure was to suit the principle to the particular borough to be treated, and not to let each borough stand or fall by a trial upon the principle. The principle, indeed, he could not discover. It changed its shape, its dimensions, and its character so often, and suited itself to such a variety of circumstances, that it was impossible to define it by any general description. Indeed, he might say of almost all the boroughs, that the rule applied to them was most delightfully vague; for, where a borough was too small to be agreeable, it was enlarged—and where it was too large, it was diminished; so that, in fact, the Ministers had been happy enough to invent a Procrustian bed of torture, calculated to reduce all boroughs to the size which suited them. Then, with respect to the borough franchise, its great merit was said to be its uniformity. In what did its uniformity consist? Would any one say that a 10*l.* house in an agricultural district, and a 10*l.* house in Manchester or the metropolis, were inhabited by the same class of persons as to respectability or station in the country? Assuredly not; and yet the franchise, which treated them as if they were, was said to be uniform. It might be a very good franchise for some places; but, in the metropolis and large manufacturing towns, it was little better than Universal Suffrage. There was no reason for the uniformity, or rather the only reason was, that it would give new influence to the democracy. But, quitting the question of the uniformity of suffrage, how was the value of the houses to be settled? "Oh," said the noble Earl (Grey), "that is extremely easy, and it is easy because the value of a 40*s.* freehold is soon settled." The noble Earl had never attended Quarter Sessions. If he had, he would have seen, in the course of a very little experience, whole days consumed by counsel in arguing as to the value of a house. Many of their Lordships, he doubted not, had seen such cases—and they would know well how to estimate the supposition of the noble Earl. But, perhaps, some way had been devised of determining the value of the houses in boroughs. Who were to be employed in this business? Why Barristers. He never heard of a case in which there were Barristers, in which there were not also Attorneys; and there being Barristers and Attorneys, how was simplicity to be expected? But this was not all. Who would be the parties most interested in the disputation of cases? Why the agents of candidates. It was, therefore, ridiculous to suppose that the value of houses in boroughs would be determined with facility. In fact, it would not be determined before the inferior tribunals; and there he must stop a moment to remark, that this was indeed a most unfortunate Bill; he meant unfortunate in failing in all the objects which it professed to have in view—for the question would have to be settled by a Committee of the House of Commons, and that surely would not be called a cheap tribunal, although this Bill was to lessen the expense of elections. The noble Earl seemed to think the Bill was the same as when the noble Earl had corresponded with Mr. Attwood, of the Birmingham Political Union. But the Bill was no such thing. It had been altered, although the noble Earl did not appear to know it. A payment of rent was necessary when the noble Earl corresponded with the Political Union, but now no such payment was necessary. In the next place, he would advert to the proposed metropolitan districts—the sections of London. They had heard of Paris being all France, and now London was to be all England. And to what class of the metropolis was this novel and fearful power to be given? Was it to be given to the responsible, to those who had something at stake, and an interest in preserving the country? No such thing. It was to be given to those who were in that station and those occupations of life which unfitted them for the trust. Their Lordships were to look for the purity of Representation in the hallowed shades of the Tower Hamlets, in the classical haunts of Billingsgate, and the modest precincts of St. Marylebone? All the beggars of London would vote. Their Lordships had heard of England's glory and Westminster's pride; but, under this Bill, Westminster's pride had better take care how he was charitable, for in relieving a beggar he might give a bribe to an elector—while, in refusing an alms he might offend a constituent. Let their Lordships fancy a general election—all their "Prides" and "Glories" in the street, all their sweet voices breaking in diapason on their ear, all their notes to be collected—why pestilence and plague would then be purity, compared to the atmosphere at a metropolitan election! These were but a few of the objections which he felt to this measure, but they were sufficient to justify the vote he should give, and therefore he would not trouble their Lordships with more. But they were told that the people of England demanded the Bill. He would look into that assertion. He would see who really did demand this measure. In the first place, those who were to be bribed by a vote were desirous of the Bill. The Members of the close boroughs were said to be interested parties, and, therefore, not fit for judges in the case; and what then was to be said to those whose judgment was to be bribed by receiving the franchise? But by whom else was it called for? It was called for by the noble Earl, the Senior Earl of England and of Ireland (the Earl of Shrewsbury), a Nobleman high in hereditary rank. And how had that noble Earl called for it? He hardly knew how to take notice of the speech of that noble Earl in terms which should be consistent with the decorum which was due to every Gentleman in Parliament, and to every Peer in that House. But if that noble Earl had been listening to advice, in the name of God, what bigoted Jesuit could have instilled into his mind that the mode in which he asked for the Bill was a mode that was likely to induce their Lordships to grant it? The noble Earl had told them, that the present Constitution was good for nothing—that it had ruined the commerce and destroyed the prosperity of the country: he had told them that the House of Peers wanted reformation; and these were the grounds on which the noble Earl had hoped to persuade their Lordships to consent to the second reading of the Bill. The noble Earl had also told them, that the country had hitherto been governed by a foul and unjust Oligarchy, which ought to be destroyed: after which he applied himself to the reverend Bench, and told the Prelates then that they had been the foremost in rapine—that they had not only plundered the country, but been foremost in plundering it. This was the ground on which a Catholic Nobleman had called on Protestant Bishops to vote for the Bill. But if their Lordships had treated that Nobleman in the same manner, what would he have said? Or would he have been sitting in Parliament at that moment at all? If their Lordships had said to that noble Earl, "You are a Catholic, and we do not believe you; it is true that you will have to take oaths, but we believe that you will break them; we are aware that you profess your willingness to support the revenues of the Protestant Church, but we know that you mean to destroy them;" if their Lordships had used this or similar language to the noble Earl, where would have been the end of the thunders that would have been fulminated against them? Such language as the noble Earl had used on the former night might be fit language to provoke an *Auto da Fé* at Lisbon, or a *Coup d'Inquisition* at Madrid; but whoever had counselled the noble Earl to hold it in that House had given him advice which ought not to have been proffered by a Christian man, and ought not to have been adopted by a British Statesman. Again, he said, let noble Lords, both Lay and Spiritual, listen to the terms in which they were called on to vote for this Bill. Those terms amounted to this: the Constitution was to be overturned—Ireland was to be placed in the hands of the Roman Catholics—the House of Peers was to be reformed—and the reverend Bench (that hot-bed of robbery) was to share the same fate. He had done. He would leave the noble Earl to the dictates of his own conscience, and to the feeling which the country would entertain when the people heard such a cause defended by such arguments. But they had been told that, by this Bill the English Constitution would be renovated. But did it require that renovation? Let them look at the House of Lords as now constituted: they had among them high and noble names—the Russells, the Howards, the Stanleys, the Percies, and many others, connected with the proudest pages of English history; but it was no less honourable to the House to reckon among its Members those who had earned their coronets by carrying the flag of England in triumph over sea and over land; it was no less honourable to it to contain those who had raised themselves by enterprise and industry from the rolls of commerce; it was no less honourable to have received within its doors those who, by an ardent pursuit of the fine arts or of the liberal professions, had shed lustre on their country; and though all these had sprung from the people, they nevertheless ranked with the proudest and the most noble blood of the land. This, then, being the case, he should like to ask the noble Earl in what way he would reform the House of Peers? He should like to ask him, how he would set about constituting a more democratic Aristocracy? And now, on the other hand, let their Lordships look to the House of Commons. Many of their Lordships had served their apprenticeship there; many of their Lordships' sons were now pursuing the same course—so as to fit them for the performance of their duties when, by the course of nature, they should be called on to take their seats in the Upper House. In the course of that preparation they necessarily mixed much with the people, for they had the interests of every class of the people to attend to. With such a Constitution as this, he would ask the noble Earl, where he could find a better regulated democratic assembly? Then what would the noble Earl have? Oh, he would have a reform of this democratic Aristocracy and of this aristocratic democracy! But one of the arguments used by the advocates of the Bill was, that, by this measure, they were only seeking to restore to the people that which they had formerly possessed. But at what period were these rights taken away which they were now called upon to restore? He defied any man to point to that moment when the liberties of England were better attended to than at present, or when the people of England enjoyed those privileges which were to be conferred on them by this Bill? But the fact was, that it was not the Constitution of England that would be renovated by this measure. It was the spirit of Republicanism which had clothed itself in the garb and form of the British Constitution, for the purpose of misleading the weak-sighted; and which, in all the hideousness of Vampire deformity, had found its way to their Lordships. In that House, however, he trusted that it would meet with an eternal grave. That House, he hoped, would be the Red Sea of this destructive enemy—drowned in which, it would no longer frighten from their propriety the constitutional feelings and good sense of the people of England.

The Earl of *Shrewsbury* begged to be permitted to say a few words in explanation, as he considered the noble Duke, who had just sat down, had completely misunderstood the tendency of his remarks. The noble Duke was entirely mistaken in supposing that he (the Earl of Shrewsbury) had accused the Bishops of the Established Church of having been guilty of plunder and spoliation. He had stated distinctly that he intended no such thing. He only accused them of generally abetting Ministers who had been guilty of spoliation and of plundering the country. He had spoken of the Bishops, as Members of that House, in common with other Peers, and in no other character, because, in a general way, the Bishops acted in the common capacity of Members of that House. He disclaimed the slightest feeling of hostility to the right rev. Bench, however, and positively denied that he had alluded to the right rev. Prelates in their religious character.

The Earl of *Radnor* promised not to detain the House at any great length; but some points had been touched on, in the course of the debate, on which he was anxious to make a few observations. The noble Earl, who had just sat down, had explained his speech of last night precisely as he had understood it when it was spoken. The noble Earl had not accused the right rev. Prelates in their character of Christian Ministers, but he complained that they had supported Ministers in their improper policy—who were the source of great calamity to the country, who had entailed upon it a debt amounting to 800,000,000*l*.—and in that view he entirely concurred. The latter part of the noble Duke's (Buckingham) speech afforded him (the Earl of Radnor) great satisfaction, not so much from the matter contained in it, as from the admission which it implied. Though the noble Duke spoke strongly against the second reading of the Bill, and declared that he would vote against it, in order to prevent it from going into Committee, yet the noble Duke appeared to have such a hankering after the Committee, that he could not avoid going into details which properly belonged to a Committee. From the manner in which the noble Duke had treated some of the details of the Bill, their Lordships might anticipate great amusement when they went into Committee, as, no doubt, the noble Duke would favour them, in that stage of the measure, with his sentiments on those details more fully. If the objections to details, not at all affecting the principle of the measure, could be sustained in Committee, he hoped and believed that his Majesty's Ministers, like men of sense, would consent to the alterations which should be suggested. The noble Duke appeared to be extremely angry with two noble Lords (the Earl of Harrowby and Lord Wharncliffe) who had spoken last night in favour of the motion for the second reading of this Bill, for the want of consistency which, as he alleged, they exhibited in now voting for the second reading. Now, consistency was a very good thing; but, when circumstances varied, it might be a very wise good thing not to adhere to what was called consistency. For his own part, he was perfectly convinced, that the reasons which the two noble Lords had given for altering their votes were sufficient and satisfactory. But it was rather late to talk of consistency in that House. If the noble Duke, who spoke last, had turned to the noble Duke behind him (the Duke of Wellington), he would learn, that no man who had the welfare of the country at heart could adhere to a principle which left him without the power of varying his conduct according to the change of circumstances. With respect to the details, the noble Duke (Wellington), who spoke last night, had entered into them at some length; but it appeared, that he had argued throughout on a fallacy, when he endeavoured to point out the inconsistency of the Bill in reference to particular places. These allusions to the details were generally accompanied with imputations that the framers of the measure had been influenced by interested motives. It was totally inconceivable to him how any noble Lords opposite could imagine, that persons, in the situation of Ministers, could have thought of consulting their own interests on such an important occasion as the present. How could noble Lords suppose that others could act in a manner in which they were incapable of acting themselves? Nothing could be more unpleasant than to hear persons continually harping on this subject. These imputations had been ringing in the ears of the House of Commons for the last year and a-half, and now they were introduced into their Lordships' discussions. He was really astonished that men in high situations should be so foolish as to condescend to impute such mean motives to individuals. With respect to the noble Duke himself, he had, some years ago, heard a strange story relative to a great quantity of paper, which the noble Duke carried with him when he quitted office. He did not wish to dwell upon that circumstance; but when the noble Duke chose gratuitously to bring forward charges, as if they were unanswerable, he ought to recollect that he might be assailed in the same way.

He had not the pleasure of knowing any of the Parliamentary Commissioners—he was even ignorant of their names—but he took it for granted that the Ministers would not have appointed them if they had not been men of talent and respectability. He was assured, indeed, that they were most respectable individuals, and possessed of great professional talent and general knowledge. He was really ashamed that it was necessary for him to say so much on the subject, but, although he knew nothing of the Commissioners, he felt it to be his duty to defend them. Did noble Lords really mean to impute improper motives to those gentlemen? He must leave to others, who did know them, the task of defending them against such imputations, and he would measure their feelings by his own. He would now notice a very erroneous statement which was made by the noble and gallant Duke opposite last night. Alluding to the 10*l*. qualification, the noble Duke said, that it would enable any lodger, who paid 6*d*. or 7*d*. a-night for his bed, to have a vote. That was an undoubted mistake; and, if the noble Duke would read the Bill, he would perceive that it was. A man might change his residence as often as he pleased previously to registration, but he must be rated to the support of the poor; and how was it possible that a lodger, who paid 7*d*. a-night for his bed, could be rated? A noble Earl (Mansfield) had, last night, quoted from a speech delivered by Lord Chatham in 1770, in which that eminent Statesmen compared the rotten boroughs to natural infirmities, which must be borne with patience, and said, that, "though the limb may mortify, if you amputate it the patient must die." He would quote from another speech of Lord Chatham, which was, he would admit, delivered at an earlier period than that to which the noble Earl had referred, and, therefore, it might be, that the experience which his Lordship subsequently attained induced him to change his opinion. He would just observe, too, that the noble Earl supposed Lord Chatham to have used the phrase, "the patient must die," whereas his words were, "may die." The speech containing the passage which he wished to bring to the notice of their Lordships, was delivered in the course of a discussion as to the propriety of giving a direct Representation to the colonies. Lord Chatham, upon that occasion, also, described the nomination boroughs as the rotten part of the Constitution; and he added, "if it do not drop off, we must amputate it." As Lord Chatham was looked upon as an authority, he must be allowed to have the benefit of that observation. The House, however, would observe, that both he and the noble Earl were agreed that there was a rotten part of the Constitution. The quotation from Lord Chatham's speech having brought the subject to his recollection, he would just observe, that the great West-India meeting that was recently held, at which a noble Earl presided, and several Members for large and populous places took part in the proceedings, proved the fallacy of the argument, that nomination boroughs were necessary in order to enable the colonies to lay their case before Parliament. The noble Earl, likewise, contended, that Parliament ought not to deprive persons of a property which they possessed, without granting compensation, and, in support of his argument, referred to the course pursued upon the abolition of the heritable jurisdiction in Scotland. There was a great difference between that case and the question of disfranchising corrupt boroughs. An article was expressly introduced into the Act of Union, which declared, that all hereditary offices and jurisdictions should be reserved to the owners thereof, as rights of property. The compensation clause, introduced into the Act of the 20th of George 2nd. enacted, that compensation should be given to all persons who were lawfully possessed of the interests which it was the object of the Act to abolish, namely, those upon whom the right was conferred by the Act of Union. Could it be said, that this right was similar to that of appointing Members for nomination boroughs? He had the power of nominating two Members for Downton, and the noble Duke opposite (Buckingham), had the power of nominating two more for St. Mawes; but by what law did either of them possess that as a right of property? The noble Duke said, that he possessed that right by law. He wished him to point out the law. He possessed houses in Downton, as the noble Duke did in St. Mawes, but that was all. The question was, whether it was wise and proper that the noble Duke should possess the power—he believed he might call it the hereditary power, for it was enjoyed by his father, and, unless the Bill should prevent it, would descend to his son—of compelling the electors of St. Mawes to return what Members he pleased? It might be that the noble Duke exercised his power in a very proper and becoming manner; but what injury would the electors of St. Mawes sustain by being deprived of the right of voting according to the direction of the noble Duke. By losing their votes, they would not, likewise, be deprived of their houses, and, by losing his power, the noble Duke would not be deprived of his property. In the course of the discussion, the opponents of the measure had dwelt with much emphasis upon one argument, namely, that, if the measure should be adopted, it would be impossible to carry on the Government. There was this fallacy in the argument—that it was always assumed, that, before the Bill was carried into effect, the country was in a state of composure, happiness, and content—that every thing was going on agreeably to the wishes of all parties—that the Government was quietly, peaceably, and well carried on. That was a fallacy. The Government seemed, after struggling for years against the growing intelligence of the people, to have come to a stand-still; and when it was said, that the Government could not be carried on if the Bill passed, the proper reply to that was, could the Government be carried on if the Bill did not pass? It was for not introducing such a measure that the administration of the affairs of the country passed from the hands of the Duke of Wellington. He was aware that, in October last, the noble Duke, in the course of a great many explanations, insisted, that it was not on account of the question of Reform that he resigned his situation; but he never could understand how the noble Duke made that out. The case was this—on the 2nd of November, 1830, the noble Duke, after eulogizing the Constitution as it at present stood, made a declaration, that, as long as he occupied his then situation, he would never consent to its being altered. On the 15th of November, a debate took place in the House of Commons on the subject of the Civil List, on which occasion the Government was left in a minority. There then stood a notice on the books of the House of Commons for a motion on the question of Reform, three days subsequent to that defeat. On the 16th of November, however, the day after Government had been beaten in the House of Commons, the noble Duke resigned office, and stated over and over again, as he understood him, that he had done so because he found that he no longer possessed the confidence of the House of Commons, and was unwilling to embarrass the Government by meeting the question of Reform. It appeared to him, therefore, that the noble Duke felt that the enemies of Reform could not carry on the Government any longer. The noble Duke said, that the noble Earl at the head of the Government was wholly responsible for the state of the country. He denied that the noble Earl was at all responsible for the difficulties of the present moment. Let the House recollect what was the state of the country when the noble Duke went out of office. The southern counties of England were in a state of civil war, and it was notorious that the first act of the noble Earl, after kissing hands, was to proceed to a council to consider what measures were to be adopted to suppress the disturbances which prevailed. He had himself stated in the House, a few weeks after the present Ministers entered office, that the country was handed over to them in such a state, that it was the duty of Parliament to take measures to render the noble Duke and his colleagues responsible for it. He continued of the same opinion now, and, therefore, he could not allow that the difficulties of the present period were at all attributable to the noble Earl. The disturbances which existed, when he entered office, had ceased, for the measures to which he resorted soon put an end to them. Why those measures were not adopted before, he did not know; for he really thought, that, if they had been carried into execution boldly at the commencement of the disturbances, they would not have proceeded further. At all events, for the suppression of those disturbances the country had to thank the noble Earl. The noble Duke next said, that the Government had done every thing in their power to cause the excitement which prevailed throughout the country on the subject of Reform. For his part, he knew of nothing which the Government had done in this respect. On the first day the noble Earl took office, he came down to the House and stated the principles upon which he had received his Majesty's commands to carry on the Government, and one of those principles was Reform. On that occasion, a noble Marquis stated his views with respect to Reform, which appeared to him so unsatisfactory, that he pressed the noble Earl to state the nature of the Reform which he intended to propose. The noble Earl would not comply with his request, and, perhaps, he was wrong in having urged it at such a moment. Nothing was known of the Ministerial plan for several months, but the country was ripe for the question. County meetings were held in every part of the country, to petition for Reform. In Wiltshire, where he resided, a county in which it was difficult to get up a county meeting, and in which a strong Tory feeling prevailed, the inhabitants assembled, and agreed to petition for Reform. He was concerned in getting up that meeting. The only part he took on the occasion was, to write to all the gentlemen whom he knew, to ask, whether they would sign the petition if agreed to. Attempts were very naturally made, by some persons interested in rotten boroughs, to prevent the meeting from taking place, but they did not succeed. If reference were made to the journals of the House, they would find that, before the Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, numerous petitions were daily presented to that House, praying for a large measure of Reform, and not unfrequently for the Vote by Ballot. The noble Duke further said, that the demand for Reform rose out of what he called the unfortunate events which occurred in Paris in July; and that the influence of those events upon the public mind in this country was manifested at the general election. It happened, however, that most of the elections were over before the intelligence of the Revolution arrived from Paris. The noble Duke must recollect the strong demonstration of public feeling in Yorkshire, when the noble individual who now sat on the Woolsack was elected Member for that county; and surely he would not contend that it was the result of the events at Paris. It appeared to him of the utmost importance to the safety of the country, that the Bill should be carried, as, from what he heard and saw, he believed it would be. A right rev. Prelate, who spoke on the first night of the discussion, stated, that, after balancing all the arguments for and against the measure, he had come to the resolution of opposing it on the ground of morality. No one could entertain a higher opinion than himself of the learning and piety of that most rev. person; but he was astonished to hear him say, that he could not support the Bill on the ground of morality, when its object was to destroy bribery, corruption, perjury, and hyprocrisy, and all those vices which were notoriously connected with the present system. It was contrary to reason—it was contrary to every thing which ought to actuate man—that he or the noble Duke should have the power of sending two Members to the House of Commons, under the hypocritical pretence that they were the Representatives of the people. Every honest and sincere man must be anxious to get rid of such a system by almost any means that he could. It had been said, that the 10*l.* franchise would throw the elections into the hands of the Political Unions, which had been originally formed for the purpose of combining to raise wages, and which might be directed to the most dangerous objects. He did not believe that these apprehensions would be verified. The noble Duke said, that the noble Earl at the head of the Government was fighting under the banners of Mr. Attwood. He was not aware that the noble Earl ever received Mr. Attwood as the avowed deputy from the Birmingham Political Union, but he was assured that the noble and gallant Duke, when he was at the head of Government, did receive Mr. Attwood in that character. It was supposed that the 10*l.* voters all over the country would act in union as one body, as if they had no connection with those above or those below them. In countries like India and China, where there were *castes,* there might be a description of persons who could live only in 10*l.* houses, but in this country such a thing was impossible. The persons who lived in 10*l.* houses in England were some of a higher, some of a lower condition in life—some of better and some of inferior education; but they would all more or less be connected with those above and those below them. They would not possess an isolated feeling, but would partake of the general feeling of society. Take the case of Westminster, for example, in which there were voters of various descriptions—some 10*l.*, others 15*l.*, and others 20*l.* He had not analysed the poll-books, but no one, he apprehended, would doubt, that on the occasion of a contested election, some of these voters would be found voting for each of the candidates. This allusion to Westminster reminded him of another argument which was employed against the Bill. It was said, that after the Bill passed, it would be impossible for the Members of the Government to find electors who would return them to the House of Commons. It happened that Mr. Fox was elected three times for Westminster when he was Minister. Lord Hood also was returned for Westminster whilst he held office; and very recently Sir John Hobhouse, on accepting office, vacated his seat, and was re-elected for the same place. In conclusion, he must express an earnest hope that the Bill would be read a second time. He was the last person who would wish to resort to intimidation in order to induce their Lordships to agree to the measure; but he did not conceive that it was intimidation to call upon the House to consider the evil consequences which would result—perhaps to themselves, but certainly to the country —from a decision against the Bill. Every person appeared now to admit the necessity of some Reform. Even the noble Earl who spoke so ably last night admitted the necessity of Reform, though last year he expressed a wish that the question should be postponed two years longer for consideration. The noble Duke himself (the Duke of Wellington) had at last declared that some Reform must take place; and the only question remaining was, the extent to which it should be carried. Many of their Lordships seemed to be excessively angry with the noble Earl for having, acting upon his own judgement of what was right, introduced this particular measure of Reform. It was, however, the only plan which their Lordships had before them, and they must either accept or reject it. A noble Baron had, on the first night of the debate, urged their Lordships to reject the Bill at once. He knew not what consequences the noble Baron expected to follow that rejection, or whether the course he had adopted was suggested by the vain hope of upsetting the Ministers and coming back to place; but he entreated their Lordships, who were now all Reformers, to reflect whether the best thing they could do was not to unite in supporting the second reading of the Bill; and thus giving themselves an opportunity of at least considering it in Committee. The noble Lord concluded by stating, that he should give his sincere and hearty assent to the second reading of the Bill.

The Duke of *Wellington* begged to assure the House, that when he last night read the return to which the noble Earl had alluded, he had no intention of making any personal allusion. His purpose in reading that paper was, to point out to the noble Earl near him the different anomalies contained in the Bill. The noble Earl (the Earl of Radnor) had stated, that, when he was in office, he received a deputation from the Political Union of Birmingham. It was certainly not impossible that Mr. Attwood and a deputation from the Birmingham Political Union might have had an interview with him. He had, however, no recollection of the circumstance; but of this he was sure, that he had never received, Mr. Attwood or any other persons as Members of any political club.

The Bishop of *Lincoln* said, that he should not long trespass on the indulgence of their Lordships, and that nothing but his extreme anxiety to state the reasons which would influence his vote on the present occasion could have induced him to offer himself to their Lordships' notice at all. When last year he had been called upon to vote on the Reform Bill, he felt that he had but a choice of evils. Upon the present occasion he also conceived that he had only a choice of evils; and his object must be now, as it was before, to choose according to the best of his ability that which was the least evil. When the former Bill was brought up to their Lordships House, the public mind was in a state of great excitement; and a season of great excitement, he thought, was of all seasons the most unfit for legislating on any subject. Although, therefore, he was not insensible to the inconveniences and to the hazard which must arise from the rejection of the former Bill, yet he felt that to reject it was at that time to choose the least evil. The majority by which that Bill had been rejected was composed of two classes—of those who were unfriendly to all Reform; and of those who, whatever might be their opinion of the desirableness of Reform, yet felt that the time had arrived when a great change must take place in the Representative system. By a great change in the Representative system, he meant that the power of sending Members to Parliament must be conferred on large manufacturing and commercial towns, and, as a consequence, that there must be disfranchisement—either partial disfranchisement according to the suggestion of the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham)—

or total disfranchisement according to the present Bill; and that there must be an extension of the elective franchise. He was one of the latter class of persons. He thought that there must be a change in the Representative system; and in the course of the present Session of Parliament, he had been looking with anxious expectation to see some influential Member of their Lordships' House, possessing the same sentiments as himself, lay on the Table of the House a Bill more consonant than the present measure with the opinions they both entertained. If that had been done, when called upon to vote for the second reading of the Bill now before the House, he should have been able to have pointed to a specific measure, and to have said that that measure contained his sentiments, and he should thus have proved that he was not unfriendly to all Reform. His hope, however, in this respect, had been disappointed. No such measure had been proposed; and he agreed with the noble Baron who spoke last night in thinking that the notice given by the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) had come too late. He was, therefore, placed in the same situation in which he stood last Session, and must either vote for the rejection of this Bill, or for its going into Committee. But had no change taken place in the public feeling since he had given his former vote? At that time such was the excitement of the public mind, and so strong the feeling in favour of this particular measure, that he believed that a modification of the Bill would have been scarcely less distasteful to the public than its entire rejection. What was the state of public feeling now? There existed an intense anxiety for the settlement of this question, on account of the injury which must, so long as it continued in suspense, be inflicted on the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests. There existed also a general persuasion that the question could only be settled by the introduction and adoption of some considerable measure of Reform; and there prevailed, moreover, a growing indifference to this particular Bill. He had already expressed his opinion that even a a modification of the former Bill would, at the time of its rejection, have been distasteful to the public mind; but he believed now that the people would be satisfied with any modification which their Lordships, supposing they should concur in the principle of the Bill, should think proper to introduce into its details. He confessed that he had heard with great regret the declaration of the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government that he would admit of no alteration of the amount of the franchise in great towns, and he trusted that the noble Earl would be induced to reconsider that declaration. The noble Earl in answer to the objection made to the 10*l.* franchise, on account of its uniformity, stated that it was uniform in appearance, but not uniform in reality. That was undoubtedly the case, but the 10*l.* franchise would have in operation, the effect of being high among a small population, and low among a large population. This was, he conceived, the very reverse of what should be the case, and though he must vote for going into the Committee, he distinctly stated that he never could give his vote for that clause as it stood at present.

The Earl of *Falmouth* said, he would first take the liberty of expressing his humble thanks to the noble Earl (Shrewsbury) who spoke from the cross benches, for so useful an explanation of his most extraordinary and not very becoming charge against the Bench of Protestant Bishops. Certainly, some explanation was required, and what was it which had been given? Why, the noble Earl had said, that the right rev. Bench were not indeed principals in all this spoliation, robbery, and corruption; they only aided and abetted in its perpetration, they were only accomplices, and thus it seems they were liable to the same punishment in public opinion. The noble Earl had received so suitable a return from others, for his very feeling and correct compliment to the prelates of their Church, that he (Lord Falmouth) would not risk spoiling it by further comments of his, or say more upon his speech than that fortunately for the right rev. Bench, the noble Lord was not yet their judge. With regard to the noble Earl (Radnor) who spoke last but one, he should not certainly be inclined to quarrel with his good humoured mode of reasoning, or take it in a very serious point of view, if he did not recollect that the noble Earl was the determined advocate of Vote by Ballot. The noble Lord always came down upon them with his borough of Downton. As to that borough, if the Bill were to pass, he supposed the noble Earl would shine forth as another of those patriots who sacrificed their interests upon the altar of their country. If not, he would probably return Mr. Cobbett as he had before intended to do; so that the success of his patriotic efforts would be rather unfortunate for his much respected friend Mr. Cobbett. The noble Earl said, that the sending Members to Parliament for nomination boroughs was an act of "base hypocrisy." Now, the noble Lord had himself sent Members for that description of place; and would the noble Earl allow him, without offence, to ask whether, if he were to return Mr. Cobbett, he should feel it right to apply such hard words to his own act. He now came to the speech of the noble Baron, who concluded the debate last night. He extremely regretted that that noble Baron had seen fit to reverse the course which he had pursued last year. He (Lord Falmouth) had paid particular attention to the former speech of that noble Baron, and was so much gratified with it, that he should have considered himself quite ungrateful, if he had exposed himself to the counteracting influence of what the noble Baron led their Lordships to expect from him, on this occasion, without refreshing his memory by reference to the arguments it contained. He happened to have noted down those arguments very particularly, and thought he could not do better than enable the House to compare them with those which he used now, leaving it to their Lordships to draw their own conclusion. A noble Duke, whom he did not now see (the Duke of Wellington) had already placed one or two of them in fair contrast with the noble Baron's present conduct, and now that the House had heard his vindication, he would beg leave to do so a little more fully. First, however, he owed it to the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government to say that he certainly had, at length, explained very clearly and explicitly what he considered the three indispensable principles of this Bill. He had, at length, very clearly stated that—not only were disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and the extension of the right of voting the principles of the Bill—but that he considered the schedules A, B, C, D, and the 10*l.* franchise, as part and parcel of those three principles. Upon those principles the noble Earl had declared himself inexorable; and with reference to each of these, let them now see what were the opinions of the noble Baron in October last. In his speech of October, the noble Baron after saying that the Bill was one of the greatest delusions ever practised, he first applied himself to disfranchisement. He defended, and very forcibly defended nomination, as checking the ebullition of popular feeling, and preventing mere delegation. "The Bill," said he, "destroys this salutary check, and substitutes nothing in its stead." He further said, "If England, Ireland, and Scotland be taken together, the faults of the one will be found to be corrected in the working of the whole." Did he hope to restore these checks upon the popular will? Did he now hope to make as good a system for England, Scotland, and Ireland out of this Bill in Committee? The noble Baron then went on to speak of enfranchisement. He objected to the number of towns to be enfranchised; he denied that the right to direct Representation was inherent in those towns, and said, that care should be taken against this overwhelming force in the Representation, speaking especially of manufacturing towns, which, from the mode of their election, could not fail to increase the influence of popular feeling. Then, as to the landed interest, he added, "If you mean to create a fair balance for the landed interest, you should not give additional Members to a manufacturing county, such as Yorkshire, but to the agricultural counties, for otherwise there will be no balance at all, and the agricultural interest will be most unfairly treated." Upon another material point, the noble Baron, said, "the Bill does not, as it pretends to do, preclude voters in towns from voting in counties;" and having shewn the way in which his objection would work, he adds, "the provisions of this Bill are so many attacks on the landed interest; and, by including tenants at will, it must almost instantly lead to the necessity of the vote by ballot." Now, if the noble Lord meant with respect to these enfranchising clauses, to get rid of one half, or one-fourth, or even one-twentieth of his objections, he directly contradicted his own opinion of our chances in Committee, most pointedly given last year, as would presently appear. Then, with respect to extending the franchise, the noble Baron, said in October, "The 10*l.* franchise will lead to almost Universal Suffrage. Ministers soon became frightened at this monster of their own creation, but the press forbade them to alter it, as they proposed; and though it would enfranchise weekly tenants of 3*s.* 4*d.* or 3*s.* 6*d.* they were obliged to make out it was an inadvertency, and to return to it as it first stood." Again, "the period of occupation should be on the principle of scot-and-lot; they make the franchise far too low, supposing their plan admissible." Now, their Lordships all remembered the famous inadvertency too well, to require that he should remind them of it more particularly; but in this decided way did the noble Baron declare, and press his objections to the three main principles of the Bill. He exposed the fallacies and absurdities contained in every clause, and almost every line of it—he reminded them of the "movement" party exulting in its certain effects—of the open avowal of the noble Lord who brought it into the other House of Parliament, that it could not be final; he told them that the late meetings convened to support it in Yorkshire, and elsewhere, had been utter failures, and that it was by the abuse of the Royal name, which made the people think they were struggling for their King against "the boroughmongers," that "the Whigs had floored the Tories." But, he (Lord Falmouth) would beg the House especially to observe what the noble Baron said of the idea of success in Committee in amending this Bill; the noble Baron argued thus last October: "Many in the House of Commons voted for the second reading, for the purpose of amending the Bill in Committee—and what was the result? Why, they found themselves laughed at when it was too late." "This, then," he continues "ought to be a lesson to us, for it would be our fate to be laughed at, if, after the experience we have had, we were weak enough to pursue a similar course." And it was after that speech which the noble Baron delivered barely six months ago, that the noble Baron expected their Lordships, to take his advice, and go into Committee! But they had now the noble Baron's other speech before them, in which he exclaims, with equal vehemence, that "he is not to be told that no alteration is to be made in Committee!"* He did not understand by what reasoning the noble Baron, who himself said, that if they went into Committee, they should only be laughed at, arrived at the conclusion that they were likely now to follow his advice. How fortunate the noble Baron was in his arguments last night, their Lordships had heard, but one thing fell from him, which for his own sake, they must wish he had not said. He said, at the same time, professing to treat the noble Duke with that respect which no doubt he really felt, that the early habits of the noble Duke, who had so ably exposed the danger of this measure, had not been such as to qualify him for a knowledge of constitutional matters such as these. But as everything affecting that noble Duke affected the House and the country, he should consider it an affront to both were he to say much upon that remark of the noble Baron. Why, the noble Baron seemed to forget that for a period at least three times as long as he had himself sat in that House, the noble Duke had been engaged in the civil service of the country. However, as he had said before, he would not comment at any length on that remark, and the less so, because he could not but think that the noble Baron was himself, by this time, sorry that he had made it. But what improvement in his own constitutional knowledge had the noble Baron derived from his seat in that House? Why this, that he thought if a Minister of the Crown, who declares that he will stand or fall by a particular Bill, after having a considerable majority against him, should choose to bring it in over and over again, their Lordships were bound to pass his Bill in some shape or other. That was the constitutional knowledge which the noble Baron seemed to have gained from his seven years' seat in that House. Really, if the noble Baron had not told them that he was as much against this measure as that of last year—though for some reason or other, still anything but explained, he felt himself compelled to vote for it, he (Lord Falmouth) should have supposed, from the chief part of his speech, that he was the greatest of all intimidators in favour of it. All that he had said last night resolved itself into this:—"You must pass this measure or a worse than this. The people will have this Bill, therefore you must pass it in some shape or other. I know it will ruin my country—I see we cannot get over its effects, but it will be dangerous to vote against it; and though I shall vote for the second reading, I shall leave all the consequences to the authors of it." Now his (Lord Falmouth's) constitutional knowledge taught him that it was the business of that House rather to consider the interests than the will of the people. But then he says:—"Oh! I expected last year a much less majority than forty one. This large and unlooked for majority supported my opinions, and, therefore, what? Why, I mean to vote against those opinions—though I still hold them now." Then the noble Baron cries, "My Lords, I warned you, in the case of East Retford, of what you might expect; you would not take my warning, and you must now take the consequences." Unfortunately for the effect of the noble Baron's warnings with regard to this Bill, he happened to have given them to their Lordships both ways, and, therefore, they had a right to make their choice between them. When the noble Baron compared the manner in which his sentiments in October were received by the House with the manner in which his speech of last night was received, the noble Baron must be led to doubt a little himself about the propriety of the course which he had pursued. Their Lordships well remembered the cheers which accompanied his former speech. But whence came the cheers on the present occasion?—all from the authors of the measure he so much deprecated, and was not that sufficient to alarm him? The noble Baron himself, last year, quoted from a speech in another place, the exclamation of Cromwell. He (Lord Falmouth) thought he now saw the noble Whigs applying that quotation in a very natural way, and saying to themselves, triumphantly, "The Lord has delivered him into our hands." Be that as it might, to use another phrase of the noble Baron's own (rather a pugnacious one), having last year shown "the Tories how to floor the Whigs," he seemed now determined to teach the Whigs how to floor the Tories. Another noble Lord (the Earl of Haddington), who also spoke in October with great effect, but had now addressed them with anything but effect, unless it was the reverse of what he intended, called this Bill a most unhappy Bill. For the object he now had in view, he must call his speech of last night a most unhappy speech; for argument in favour of the second reading there was none; whilst there were many, and very good ones, against it. He said that, if he thought the 10*l.* franchise would be persisted in, he would not vote as he intended to do. Why, had the noble Earl at the head of the Government, or had he not, declared that this was one of the vital principles of the Bill? But the House really ought to be very grateful to the other noble Earl for his recent speech, and, therefore, he would only say further upon it, that he joined in the thanks which were due to him, though, if he would allow the House to make a choice, it would rather have his vote. Of the address of a noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby), whose high character had led them to expect very different things from him. He must say, with the greatest regret, he wished he could respect the course he was pursuing as much as he did his superior abilities and known integrity. He, too, did not retract one syllable of his former opinions; yet even his talents could not make out a tolerable case in vindication of his altered conduct. After stating that his two great objections to the last Bill—namely, that the new elective franchise was to be founded on population alone, and that corporate rights were only to continue during the lives of their present holders, were done away (as if that excellent address, so strongly impressed upon their Lordships minds, had related solely, or even principally, to those two points), he now told them, that, if they failed in Committee, they should be only where they were before! He must express his astonishment at such an assertion from such a quarter. Why, the noble Earl who moved the second reading had plainly told them, that when they had voted for the second reading, they would have acknowledged the main principles of the Bill; and could it still be said, that they should only be in Committee where they were before? The parrot cry of "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," the noble Earl said had ceased; and then, that, if it appeared too democratic, they must endeavour to save some planks from the wreck, upon which they might float in comparative safety. In vain did he ask himself for anything like a sound reason for the noble Earl's change; and, if they were to look for it in metaphors, he would prefer floating in the good vessel of the State, which had rode upon many a sea, and weathered many a gale, to the rotten planks which the noble Earl would throw out to them. Why was it that men like the noble Earl would rush into the treacherous stream of conciliation, when they knew it must inevitably force them to the cataract? In the recent declaration of another noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), that he saw nothing that should induce him to depart from the course he before determined upon, there was reason for far other feelings. That noble Earl, then, upon principle, opposed this unjustifiable Bill; and, although a Reformer all his life, he was perfectly consistent in so doing. He well knew, and he most ably and usefully pointed out, the difference between rational Reform and this revolutionary measure. He had not now been scared from his declared duty by unconstitutional threats—which bold, indeed, must that Minister be who would dare to execute; he would not suffer the vital interests of his country to be trifled with by the doubtings of infirm minds, or whispered away by mischievous intrigue. He honoured the noble Earl for it, but his straightforward conduct, as well as the eloquence by which he had supported it, could require no eulogy of his. He would not take up the time of the House, by saying much upon the speech of the noble Earl at the head of the Government, with which he opened the debate. The same absence of appeals to history, the same want of all example, ancient or modern, in vindication of his visionary scheme, the same abuse of the present system, without showing that the new one would remedy its defects—the same exaggeration of the dangers of rejection, and the same reliance upon his wretched and unproved expediency to justify so unprincipled a measure—had attended this and all the noble Earl's former speeches. He (Lord Falmouth) asserted, that this Bill, considered with the alleged reasons for forcing it again upon the Legislature, formed one mass of contradictions. It was virtually confessed, that the noble Earl could not now control the people, and yet he would give more power to the people! Democracy was already too powerful, yet he would give an immense increase of power to the mob!—the noble Earl was even unable to prevent the disgraceful riot last year in London (at least so he would in charity suppose) and he wished to double the number of Members for London and its suburbs!—thus also doubling the certainty of constant tumult and disorder through the excitement of metropolitan elections!—The noble Earl declared, that his object was permanent tranquillity, whilst he took the means of all others the most likely to prevent, for ever, the return of that greatest national blessing. His noble friend (Lord Ellenborough) who answered the noble Premier with such extraordinary power and effect, had well described the artificial state in which the population of this country existed — he had shown how frequently their contentment must depend upon extraneous circumstances, over which no government could have control, and that as these might be prosperous or adverse, the people would be placid or disturbed. They were taught by history, that nations, as individuals, have their growth, their maturity, and decay. At the middle stage of their maturity, he feared they had for some time arrived—he was convinced, that from the moment they passed that or any such Bill, their last stage would have begun. Public confidence could not be restored by Legislative robbery, nor could they improve the temper or regulate the power of the people, by unreasonable concession to the one, and the abandonment of their only checks upon the other. In regard to the last election, as he had before declared his sentiments upon that disastrous measure through the indulgence of the House, he would not recur to it now, except to repeat, that the popular feeling then manifested was not the cause, but mainly the effect of this most violent and mischievous Bill, and that the historian, when he might hereafter bewail the downfall of the British empire, would prove that to demonstration. What he dreaded was, the disappointment of the people, and the power of revenge that they must derive from so violent a change, when they found themselves thus shamefully deceived. It was well for the noble Earl (Earl Grey) to say—"Upon me alone be all the consequences, if it should fail." Would that this could be so, though he harboured no harsh feelings against him; but the consequences must fall upon his country; and, as the noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby)—not more eloquently than with reference to his own subsequent conduct inconsistently—expressed it—"We must share in the punishment, though we have not been accomplices in the crime." What the people wanted was, not this violent Bill—but good Government. If much of the national evils were to be ascribed to extraneous circumstances, he was afraid the Government had been by no means free from domestic errors; and, if that was true, a return to sound principles in trading and commercial affairs, in finance and colonial policy, might yet restore the nation to a more prosperous and healthy state. Give them these, and this great empire might recover, but by this Bill they must inevitably destroy it. The Bill for changing the Representation of Ireland, though not yet before them, was declared to be part and parcel of this ruinous measure; and he would implore their Lordships to look at the present state of that unhappy country. Was there anything there—and he addressed himself especially to the right rev. Bench—which should induce them to support the authors of this Bill? Had they not seen a man whose boast was constant agitation, whose object was avowed and notorious, who had caused more misery and bloodshed than any man living, and who was the worst and most interested enemy of the Protestant Church—had they not seen that man, when recently escaped from the vengeance of the law, raised to honours by the advice of the Ministers? And had there been any other stated reason for such advice, than that he was a man of talent and ability? Before the present day, they used to hear of other qualifications for office, and other claims to promotion, besides mere talent and ability. They used to hear of tried integrity, public conduct, and approved services. Why, the thief and the pickpocket had often talent and ability. He would entreat the right rev. Bench to reflect, whether the Bill would not give this dangerous agitator an immense increase of power, and whether he would not use it to destroy the Irish Protestant Church? The Minister might say he had no such intention, but Mr. O'Connell cried exultingly—give me but this Bill, and I do not care a farthing for your intentions. If it should pass, he would assert that nothing could prevent the re-ascendancy of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland. And now he must say a word or two on this point, though he would willingly have avoided it. In 1829 they passed the Catholic Relief Bill. It was painful to him to look back upon that memorable year; but they would do him the justice to remember, that—he not only then expressed an earnest hope that his gloomy anticipation of its effects might prove unfounded, but he declared that from that time his lips, with respect to it, should be closed. He had kept his promise. As honest men, he and those with whom he acted, opposed that Bill, because they foresaw its consequences. They had been silent since it passed, because they had felt that silence was the course which, as honest men, they should pursue. But why did he mention the Catholic Relief Bill now? Not for his own justification, but to remind their Lordships that the noble Duke, who proposed it, not only looked upon the town Representation as a necessary check upon its operation, but with the clear perception for which he was distinguished, accompanied it with another for raising the county franchise, as an essential prop to that Representation. What did the Reform Bills now propose? They would, indeed, leave the prop which the noble Duke had erected, but they would take away the building itself; and since they must depend upon each other for mutual support, the prop would then fall useless to the ground. If they passed this Bill, the repeal of the union must follow—then the downfal of the Irish Church—and then the rapid dismemberment of the British empire. "But (said the noble Earl) is there any other claim which the present Government can urge to the support of the right rev. Bench? My Lords, I must not forget one which, perhaps, the noble Earl at the head of it, may bring forward. To his Administration belongs the high honour of promulgating, for the first time, a system of national education not founded upon the Bible. It is in vain to say that extracts, admissible by both religions, are to be allowed in the Irish schools. If the Protestant child should ask why the Bible, itself, is not admitted, what must be the only answer? That the Roman Catholics will not allow it. If the child should ask further whether it is not a dereliction of duty on the part of the Government, the Legislature, and the Church, to bow to this wish of the Roman Catholics in a matter so sacred as scriptural education, what answer can be afforded? Let the Protestant Bishop who can support the second reading of this Bill, for confirming such a Government in power, look to his conscience, if he can. But, if the right rev. Prelates should not see reason in these acts to distrust the noble Premier, they will do well to consider whether Ministers, are, in fact, their own masters—whether there is not a third power in the State to which they have bowed down their heads, and which this Bill is intended to propitiate. My Lords, there are two large but very opposite bodies anxiously watching your conduct. On one hand there is the great body of Protestant clergymen whom you represent in this House, united with an immense number of the chief landed proprietors, and other lovers of order, and the Constitution. They implore you to act firmly, and not to risk, by one false step, which a mistaken spirit of peace may induce you to take, the passing of this ruinous Bill. On the other, there is the party of "the movement," borrowing for their purposes the countenance of the Government, and pretending to respect, though they know they abuse, the name of their King. Choose between them; but I say that if through your making this false step the Bill should pass, it is impossible you can recover it. I trust those right rev. Prelates will not forget the attempts which are even now daily making to overthrow the Church Establishments in both countries. It was not long since, that a Gentleman (Mr. Hume) stated, in another place, where his opinion was received by no means without support, that clergymen ought to be paid like the officers of the army and navy! This same Gentleman, in the year 1824, was the author of that notable motion, 'with regard to the expediency of inquiring whether the present Church Establishment of Ireland be not more than commensurate to the services to be performed, both as regards the number of persons employed, and the income they receive.' He was supported by about forty-five Members of the Parliament of that day; and out of that number of forty-five, how many were Members of the present Government? Why, my Lords, eleven Members of the present Government voted in favour of that inquiry! My Lords, before I sit down, I must apply myself once more to the noble Baron, (Wharncliffe) who told you last year that you would deserve to be laughed at, if you went into Committee upon this Bill. I cannot conclude without quoting to your Lordships once again from the recorded sentiments which he then so conspicuously declared. With regard to the right rev. Prelates, to whom I never address myself without the greatest veneration, he said:—'True they were the ministers 'of peace. It was their business to preach 'peace amongst all men. But what did 'those right rev. persons sit in that House 'for? Was it for their own sakes merely? 'No! it was to represent the interests of the 'Church. The interests of the Church 'were in their hands. Those rev. Prelates 'must be aware that the feeling of the great 'body of the ministers of the Church was 'against the Bill, and that it had been 'manifested conspicuously on more than 'one occasion, and it was their duty not to 'flinch from voting against the measure.' To the House generally, the noble Baron said:—'No man saw more clearly than 'himself the evil consequence which would 'result from the rejection of the measure, 'but the motives on the other side, 'were so strong as completely to over'power all anxiety on that account. 'He besought the Peers of England, 'as they valued their character, as 'they valued the station which they 'held, either by the favour of their Sove'reign, or by inheritance, to show that the 'Peers of England when called upon to 'do their duty would not be intimidated 'by menaces nor guided by interest. He 'placed great reliance on the good sense 'of the people of England. He had ne'ver known them to act unjustly towards 'those who were influenced by a conscien'tious sense of duty. He fearlessly left it 'to the people of England to form an 'impartial opinion of the conduct which 'the House of Peers would pursue on the 'occasion.'* The noble Baron concluded this eloquent appeal last October, by moving "that the Bill be rejected" and the same noble Lord concluded, last night, by urging upon your Lordships the necessity of reading this Bill a second time! My Lords, being very sensible that any attempt of mine to imitate the appeal I have just quoted, would be little likely to add to its weight, I shall trouble you with but few more words on this most vital subject. If I am told that popular feeling caused this Bill, I say the Bill has been a main cause of the popular feeling: if that the people wish for Reform—I say, not this, and nothing like this Reform: if that opposition will be dangerous, I answer that concession will be to this House, and to the British empire, destruction. My Lords, I also shall pursue "the straightforward course," and vote against the second reading of this revolutionary Bill."

---

* See Hansard's Debates, (third series), vol. vii. p. 969, *et sub*, for these extracts from Lord Wharncliffe's speech.

---

* Hansard's Debates, (third series) vol. vii. p. 986, 987.

The Marquis of *Bristol* spoke to the following effect:*—I had hoped that deference for the opinion expressed by this House on the Reform Bill of last Session would have produced such modifications in the Bill now before us, as would have allowed of our considering it in Committee, consistently with the important considerations on which our decision last October was founded. In that hope I have been disappointed. The Bill now before us is quite as revolutionary in its principle as the former one, and it contains the same sweeping and indiscriminate spoliation of all chartered rights, which if sanctioned by this House would shake to their foundations all the vested interests, and ultimately all the rights of property, in this great empire. No man can feel that disappointment more deeply than I do; for I should ill discharge my duty by the country, if, with the view which I have taken of the danger which threatens us, I could satisfy myself with having contributed by my vote to ward off that danger for the moment, and did not endeavour to make some permanent provision against its recurrence. It is undoubtedly true that there is no real and lasting security against dangerous extortion, but the wise and timely concession of what is just and reasonable; but the rash concession of what is unjust and unreasonable, would have a directly opposite effect, and could only increase our danger and accelerate our ruin. If I am opposed to the present measure, it is only because I think it most unjust and most unreasonable—it is only because I believe it would be fatal to the country. I am sure there is in my heart no cold and criminal indifference to the wants and wishes of my fellow subjects. I am equally certain that I have no party views to serve on this occasion. All that I have ever loved and valued in public life are in their graves with the exception of two, who are in absolute retirement; and if they were still candidates for political power, I would confidently ask the noble Earl opposite, at the head of the Government, whether he thinks I would be swayed by party motives at such a crisis. He will recollect the cordial support which I gave to the administration of 1806, of which he was so conspicuous a member; and he will recollect, that when that Administration retired upon principles which I approved, I followed them into opposition for twelve years, although by so doing I separated myself from the individual in the country whom I best loved and most respected, the late Lord Liverpool, with whom I never had a difference upon any one point, with the single exception of concession to the Catholics. And, my Lords, after having passed my whole life in one uniform struggle for the completion of religious toleration, it would be hard indeed if any one could suspect me of disgracing the evening of my days, by placing myself in opposition to the extension of the civil liberties of mankind. No, my Lords, it is because I firmly believe, that the measure in contemplation would inflict upon those liberties the deepest wound that they have ever yet received from the hand of man, that I am opposed to it. That there are imperfections in the representation of the country, no man of common candour can possibly deny; but his must indeed be a presumptuous mind, who would venture to maintain, that in any plan which could be proposed by human wisdom, and which had not as yet undergone the test of experience, there might not be the seeds of evils far exceeding in number and magnitude those of the present system. It is the lot of man to derive his best and safest lessons from experience, and surely this consideration alone might well justify the friends of the Constitution in their unwillingness to exchange that which experience has taught them to be good for that which conjecture flatters them would be better; and in resisting all great and sudden changes, where, even if the change is necessary, it might be accomplished by a more gradual and a safer process. I have passed five-and-thirty years of my life in considering and re-considering the question of Parliamentary Reform; I have examined, in order to form a sound judgment as to the competency of the House of Commons to the discharge of their high and important duties, all their legislative and political acts, for a very long period; I have discussed the question in all its bearings, with many of the leading statesmen of my own times, in the unreserved confidence of private friendship; and I should feel that I wanted all common courage and common honesty, if, at a moment like the present, I could shrink from distinctly stating that I entirely concur in the opinion expressed by a noble Duke in the last Parliament, that the House of Commons, as at present constituted, is fully qualified to legislate safely, wisely, and efficiently, for the public interests. I admit that it is not enough that the House of Commons should be a good and efficient body; it ought also to possess the confidence and affection of the people; neither will I be myself such an instance of that presumption which I condemn in others, as to say, that even for practical purposes the House of Commons cannot be improved. But thus much I will venture to affirm, that it will be found a far easier task to spoil than to improve it—that many of its apparent imperfections will upon close examination, be found conducive to great practical advantages—that, owing to the great varieties in the constituent body, the House of Commons is less liable than other popular assemblies to be affected by those sudden and temporary delusions, which from time to time seize upon particular classes of the people, and is in intelligence or information, in character, by far the first assembly that ever yet met to regulate the concerns of any nation upon earth; and of this also, I am certain, that, blessed as we are with a Constitution which so fully protects all interests—which so fully secures the lives, liberties, and properties of all classes, and which so effectually enables the milk to throw up the cream, not only in Parliament, but in all the great professions and departments of the country—a degree of reluctance to tamper with that Constitution, even if it bordered upon prejudice and obstinacy, would not be the quality most to be feared nor most to be censured in a statesman or a legislator. For myself I am convinced that it would be found impossible to make any considerable innovation in the principles of Representation, which would not expose the country to dangers of the greatest magnitude, whilst, on the other hand, it could at best confer upon us a very small and precarious advantage; and that is a bad speculation in politics, as in commerce, where the chances of gain bear no reasonable proportion to the risk of loss and ruin. Deeply, however as I am impressed with the danger of rash innovation, and with the absolute madness of it in a country like ours, where so much is to be lost, and where so little can be gained, I am not one of those who think that no provision should be made to repair the dilapidations which may be caused by time in the institutions of the country, and whenever the object is really to repair and not to alter and to subvert, I, for one, shall be friendly to it. It does appear to me that the moment has arrived, (and I suppose there is no man in Parliament or out of Parliament, who, whatever may be his opinion of the still unimpaired perfections of the House of Commons, would wish things to go on without any interference, until there might be fifty Old Sarums sending Members to the House of Commons, and fifty Manchesters wholly unrepresented in the country)—it does then, I say, appear to me that the moment has arrived when it becomes Parliament to take into their serious consideration the state of the representation; to examine attentively the innovations which have occurred; to apply remedies where remedies may be required; and at all events, to arrest the further progress of those innovations, before they reach a point at which they would be productive of serious injury to the public interests. And whenever it shall be made appear that since the last settlement of the constituent body, green fields have been vivified into great and splendid cities, and that ancient cities have declined into small and insignificant places, I never can admit for a moment that there is no power in the Constitution by which practical remedies may be applied to such real diseases, without producing the smallest danger or inconvenience to the State. Neither should I object to many regulations, both in town and county elections, some of which are indeed called for by the altered state of property, and which come recommended to us by new circumstances, and not by new doctrines. This is not the opportunity for entering more minutely into the details of the question. When that opportunity arrives, I trust that all parties will bring with them a spirit of candour and moderation; and not, on the one hand, an attachment to the mere rust of the Constitution; nor on the other, a love of change, and a thirst for popularity. I trust they will come well versed in the opinions of all the great authorities on this subject, and in none more than those of the late Mr. Fox; and they will then be prepared to admit that a certain portion of the smaller boroughs are absolutely essential to the stability of the State; and that there is no change which would be more contrary to the unanimous opinion of all those authorities, than the adoption of one uniform right of election in all the towns of England. To a Reform, moderate yet really effective, conducted in this spirit, I should not yield an unwilling assent; I should claim it as a boon, and aid it as a blessing. But whenever an attempt is made to alter the general state and principles of the Representation, and to give in fact a new Constitution to the country, I must oppose it, because I know that what is begun in that spirit must soon be followed by greater and more important changes, and that the flood-gates of innovation once open, a torrent will rush in, which will not only remove the imperfections, but tear up the very foundations of the Constitution, and with those foundations tear up also the foundations of all the security and prosperity which we enjoy. It was the opinion of a great authority, that if the House of Commons ever became much more democratic in its composition, it would be too strong for the other branches of the Constitution, and this, I believe, to have been the opinion of the great majority of well-informed persons, who have ever turned their thoughts to this subject. The danger is undoubtedly a real one—such a House of Commons would, indeed, be too strong for the other branches of the Constitution, and would be too strong for the temperate use of its own power. It would represent too much of the passions, and too little of the prudence of the public, and in moments of popular delusion would make use of its irrestible power to abolish institutions, which, when too late, would be subjects of bitter and unavailing regret with themselves and with the public. God forbid that I should be a party to any measure, that I should be the advocate of any system, which could tend in the remotest manner to prevent the House of Commons from being the full and faithful Representative of all the settled feelings and opinions of the English people. I trust the day will never come when it will cease to be so; but I would have it as I would have the portrait of a friend, by a great master. I would have it the living image of the public mind in their best and calmest moments, not what this Bill would make it, a mere mirror to reflect all the transient passions and convulsions which may agitate and disfigure it. The great problem to be solved in Representation is this—how to select your Representatives—how to delegate the right of choosing them, so as to secure their being as constantly as possible in unison with the judgment of the people, with their fixed opinions, and their true interests, and as seldom as possible in unison with their passions, their prejudices, and their caprices. In my conscience I believe that the English House of Commons accomplishes this great object as fully and perfectly as it is possible to be accomplished in an assembly composed of human beings; and those who undertake to reform it would do well to consider long and deeply how far the elements of which it is composed, and the proportions in which those elements are mixed together, may be essential to a result upon which the happiness and well-being of the country absolutely depend. These are opinions not lightly formed, nor formed without due consultation with other minds capable of assisting and correcting my judgment; I believe them to be true—I know them to be honest, and that they are formed without reference to any private or selfish interest. As a Member of this House, I may feel some jealousy of any measure which tends to diminish its power and influence in the State; but all such considerations vanish from my mind when I contemplate the calamitous consequences which must ensue to all classes of society from so augmenting the power of the other House of Parliament as to destroy entirely the balance of the Constitution, and to make it, in fact, the sole master of the State. Once make the House of Commons the mere echo of the people's voice—once convert it from an assembly of trustees into an assembly of delegates, it will soon be the blind instrument of the people's will; obeying every impulse from without, there will be an end of the independent functions of this House—there will be an end of all sound and deliberate legislation—there will be an end of all stability in our laws, and of all security in our possessions; and with that security will perish, not only the fortunes of private families, but all the great incitements to industry and enterprise; for when none can keep wealth securely, who can be anxious to acquire it—with that security, that unexampled security which we have so long enjoyed, and which was, in truth, the parent and the nurse of all our greatness, will expire the vital principle of public prosperity. Despotism is the great enemy of the human race; despotism and security never can exist together; it is hateful and destructive in all its forms—it is odious on the throne—it is odious in the Aristocracy—it is odious above all, and above all to be dreaded, in a democratic form, because it is then most fierce most extensive, and most irresistible. Any extensive alteration in the Representative system would infallibly end in this worst and greatest of all evils. It is then for the sake of real liberty, and in her sacred name, that I say, pause before you enter on the dangerous course of innovation—pause before you take the first step in that steep and slippery descent which will precipitate you from the secure and happy eminence which you now occupy, into an abyss of anarchy and confusion. Those who urge you on, how do they encourage you? They have no encouragement to offer but fair promises and plausible conjectures. The friends who warn you of your danger appeal not to theory but to experience, and bid you cling to that Constitution which has made your forefathers happy and prosperous for successive generations. They bid you cling to that Constitution which has been tried and enjoyed, and loved and cherished, by the wise and good of so many ages. They bid you cling to that Constitution which has been found equally capable of resisting the encroachments of the crown and the aggressions of the people—they bid you cling to that Constitution which, whilst it does not attempt that which is impossible, to make all men and all possessions equal, effectually accomplishes that which it does profess, and gives full and equal security to all the different gradations of rank and property amongst mankind—they bid you cling to that Constitution which does all that political institutions can do for the developement of individual energies, and the promotion of public prosperity, by placing none so low as to be precluded from raising themselves to the very highest station, and by raising none so high as to be able to injure with impunity the meanest member of the community. I much fear that the new House of Commons will supply a ladder to ambitious demagogues, by which a rapid succession of ephemeral tyrants, the favourites of the day, will rise to heights, where they will be beyond the reach of all control, and be enabled, in the name of an injured and deluded people, to trample into dust the laws, the liberties, the happiness and the institutions of the country. By that Constitution, which has so long protected us against such dangers, I will make my stand. I have no means of comparing it with the dreams and visions of philosophers; but I know it to be the best which ever had a real existence amongst mankind; I know the large amount of comfort and security which we owe to it in our passage through this world, and I know that we owe to its sober and enlightened Church the knowledge of the only solid foundations of all which we can hope for in the next, and the purest instruction as to the doctrines and the duties by which those enduring interests may be secured. Let us not flatter ourselves, that that sober and enlightened Church can long survive the old Constitution. The new one will first strip it of its possessions, and then leave it to be supplanted in its doctrines. And if this Bill passes, there are those amongst us who will live to see the churches of this favoured land parcelled out amongst the cheap, unpaid ministers of wild fanaticism and blind superstition. The part, then, which I have taken on this occasion, has been taken with the full concurrence of my heart and my understanding. It is the debt of gratitude—it is the dictate of judgment—it is the mandate of conscience—it is the tribute of affection and predilection, and of reverence for institutions which I still hope that the wisdom and the moderation, and the firmness of this House will enable us to transmit unimpaired, and, if possible, improved, to our posterity. I say improved, because no one is more anxious than I am for a safe, temperate, yet effective Reform; and whenever such a measure comes before us, it shall have my best support, not with a view of giving the *minimum* of Reform, which is consistent with the hope of appeasing clamour, but with the sincere and anxious desire of giving to the public wishes the *maximum* of Reform, which is compatible with the peace, order, and security of society, and with the real interests of the people themselves—that people whom it is equally my wish, my duty, and my pride to serve, who may believe me when I assure them that there is no concession which I would withhold, but such as I thought would be injurious to themselves; and that they shall never find me amongst those base and hollow patriots, who, for a selfish and temporary purpose, would, in a moment of unnatural excitement, purchase their applause by the sacrifice of their best and dearest interests.

---

* Printed from the corrected edition, published by Hatchard and Son, to which the noble Marquis prefixed the following extract:—"And whoever will thoroughly consider in what degree mankind are really influenced by reason, and in what degree by custom, may, I think, be convinced, that the state of human affairs does not ever admit of an equivalent for the mischief of setting things afloat; and the danger of parting with those securities of liberty, which arise from regulations of long prescription and ancient usage; especially at a time when the directors are so very numerous and the obedient so few; reasonable men, therefore, will look upon the general plan of our Constitution transmitted down to us by our ancestors as sacred; and content themselves with calmly doing what their station requires towards rectifying the particular things which they think amiss, and supplying the particular things which they think deficient in it, so far as is practicable without endangering the whole."—*Bishop Butler, Sermon preached before the House of Lords on the Anniversary of King Charles' Martyrdom,* 1741.

The Bishop of *London* said, that it was with inexpressible reluctance and concern he felt himself bound on this occasion to follow and express his dissent from many with whom he generally agreed, and particularly from one for whom he felt so sincere a regard as the noble Marquis who had just spoken; but he was sure that the candour and integrity of the noble Marquis, no less than his kindness, would oblige him to admit that the conclusion to which he (the Bishop of London) came upon a political affair of the greatest moment arose from a conviction no less sincere than that of the noble Marquis. But he must say, that he would not trespass on their Lordships with his sentiments upon the present occasion did he not feel himself called upon by more than one urgent reason to offer a few words in vindication of the course which, after the most mature deliberation, he felt it his duty to pursue. And, in the first place, he must protest, with all respect and humility, but, at the same time, with firmness, against those constant appeals made from both sides of the House to the spiritual Lords, as if they were a distinct and separate body, and answerable for what they should do in a manner different from that in which any other noble Lord was answerable, and, as if they were to be urged by motives distinct from those of any other Member of that house. The noble Earl who had spoke last but one had, no doubt, with great feeling and earnestness, asked the spiritual Lords, what motive they could have to induce them to vote for this Bill, which had been brought in by his Majesty's Ministers. Now, he should say, that they —that was, those who intended to vote for the Bill—would not do so, because it was brought forward by his Majesty's Government, but because the state of the country and its affairs, in their opinion, rendered it absolutely necessary to take the subject into consideration; and, as to whether they should not vote upon this question, because of the proceedings of Government, as to a plan of education in another country, that was answered by the almost unanimous vote of the bench of Bishops, against his Majesty's Ministers. He trusted, then, that as holding a situation in the country, which rendered his character a matter of importance to others, beside himself, he should be excused if he attempted to vindicate his motives for the vote he should give, more especially, as he had been accused with vehemence, not only in that house, but elsewhere, of gross inconsistency. With respect to that charge, he must say, that it was well known to many that it was his determination to have voted for the second reading of the first Reform Bill, long before that measure had come up to the House, and, it had been no secret that it was his intention so to do, with a view to the introduction in the Committee of those alterations and amendments, of which he deemed that measure to stand in need. It was equally well known, that he had not been present, and did not vote upon that occasion; and, if he were more particularly to enter upon the reasons for that course, he had no doubt that he could easily satisfy their Lordships of its propriety. But, he would not hesitate to say generally, that he had an invincible reluctance to oppose those with whom he had always acted, and for whom he had and did feel the utmost regard and deference and respect. Now, however, with respect to this Bill, the time for neutrality had, in his opinion, gone by, and he had made up his mind to vote for its second reading, not because he cordially and entirely approved of the Bill, but because, under existing circumstances, and in the present state of the country, this appeared to him the safest and most prudent plan, recommended as it was for the second time, by a large majority of the other House and, if not by the majority, at least, by a formidable minority, of their Lordships. Influenced by these reasons, it did appear to him to be most important to review and modify its principal provisions, and therefore, it was necessary to consider it fully, with a view to the introduction of some amendments, taking care, however, that they should still be such as should not trench upon the principles of the Bill, so as to delay the speedy and satisfactory settlement of this great question. He begged the House to consider the difficulty under which he and others on the same bench laboured with respect to this subject. As regarded himself, he was of opinion, that there must be an extensive Reform. Then, they were told of another Bill, with which they might compare the present; but he had no other Bill before him; he had not heard even a hint or an intimation of any such Bill, until the noble duke (Buckingham) two nights ago, had given a notice on the subject, and, which, he agreed with the rev. Prelate who had previously spoken, had come somewhat too late; at all events, it had come too late for him, who had found it necessary to make up his mind without further delay. Then certainly, such of their Lordships were not, in his mind, to be blamed, as should consent—for that was all they were about to do—to take into their serious consideration, under the present necessity that existed, the only remedy that was proposed for a most serious and an acknowledged evil. Whether or not the remedy that was proposed was the best and wisest that could be devised, was altogether another question. Whether or not a more moderate remedy would not have satisfied the people, when the Bill was first introduced, he would not venture to pronounce. Neither would he venture to say whether or not a more cautious and sparing application of the pruning-knife to the ancient Constitution of the country would not have been sufficient to pare off its excrescences, to remove its encumbrances, to renovate its vigour, and to restore its virtue. At present they must deal with things as they were, and he could not now but express his conviction, that it would be as vain to expect that the sun would trace back his degrees on the dial, as that the people of England would ever return to the same channel of thought and of opinion as before the introduction of this measure. It was true the inundation had subsided, but the current had been turned into a new channel, from whence it never could be diverted; and, therefore, it would appear to him to be true wisdom to watch and regulate the course of the stream, to embank and secure that course, so as that it might fertilize, but never overflow, and desolate the land. No one, he admitted, could foretel the result of this, or any other plan of Reform. Every such plan must be an experiment, but it was now too late to say that the experiment ought not to be tried. The result of the trial was doubtful; but he also felt that, when the people of the country were allowed to brood over grievances, real or imaginary, the longer they remained so, the more extensive would be the remedy demanded. He was sure that, for some years, great changes had been taking place with respect to religion, in the minds of the people; of these he would not then speak, but would content himself with referring to the dangers which were said to threaten the Established Church. It had been said, that the first consequence of this Bill would be, an attack on ecclesiastical property; and, no doubt, if that occurred and succeeded, other property would next be sacrificed. But he hoped that, when the leaven of agitation had worked off, and when the country was restored to calmness and tranquillity, the people—at least, he was sure the well-informed classes would look with reverence to their ancient institutions, and would regard with an anxious wish every thing which would preserve the Constitution. It might be that this measure would tend to accelerate the progress of external reforms in the Church. He knew that he, and those in the same situation with him, had difficulties to surmount; but if they had difficulties to surmount, they could also depend upon the affection of the great mass of the people—they could reckon securely upon the support of all who loved religion, and of all those who were capable of taking the soundest views on all political matters. He would not trespass further on their Lordships' time. He would not state his views with regard to the details of the Bill. He had merely stated the reason for the vote which he should give for the second reading of this measure, in the conscientious persuasion that he thus best consulted the dignity of the House, and the peace and security of the country generally. He could not say he did so without fear, for that man must be careless and over confident who could express himself to be without some apprehension. But, if all parties were willing to concede what ought to be conceded—if each would give credit to the other for sincerity and purity of motive, and, if not yielding, at least, not outraging, even the prejudices of those who differed from them—he trusted they would be able, under the blessing of Him who had so long protected and favoured the country, to concur in the adoption of a measure which would improve the Representation, conciliate the affections of the people, and adding strength and perpetuity to whatever was valuable in our Constitution, cherish religion, and consolidate the best interests of the country.

The Bishop of *Exeter* spoke as follows:* — My Lords, it was my wish not to obtrude myself on the attention of your Lordships during the present debate, and I had resolved to act on that wish, unless some of my right rev. brethren should address the House in favour of the Bill. My Lords, my two right rev. friends near me have thought it necessary so to address your Lordships; I trust, therefore, that I shall be pardoned, if, following them with equal openness and candour, but with very unequal ability, I shall endeavour to declare the reasons which compel me to vote in opposition to them. My Lords, I feel that, of what these right rev. Prelates have said, very little, indeed, calls for any observations from me: that they are sincere—that they are disinterested—that they are persuaded that the view they have taken of this subject, and the conclusions to which they have arrived, are just, I am perfectly satisfied. Whatever observations may have been any where made on them, I profess, my Lords, that I am at a loss to discover any reasonable ground of suspicion against the purity of the motives which have actuated them on this occasion. The first point, my Lords, to which I think it necessary to apply myself is, the observation which was made by the right rev. Prelate who spoke last, with respect to the notice given by the noble Duke opposite last night. The noble Duke, my Lords, gave notice that he would bring in a Bill for a Reform of Parliament in case of the rejection of that which is now before the House; and, it is most remarkable, that this measure of Reform promised by the noble Duke coincides, in a very extraordinary manner, with the opinions and feelings expressed by the right rev. Prelate. Now, my Lords, I should have thought that the natural course for him to have taken would have been to say, 'I rejoice to find, 'that, after all the delay which has taken 'place—after all the disappointment to 'which I have been subjected in not having 'before had a measure submitted to my 'consideration which accorded with my 'views, I shall now have what I have so long 'wanted—a rival expedient will be pro'posed, which falls in so peculiarly with 'my own feelings and my own notions that 'I cannot hesitate to wait for it.' [The Bishop of *London:* No! no!] The right rev. Prelate says, "No, no." I do not know where I was wrong in the statement I have made of the opinions which he has expressed, but if I have misrepresented him, I am sure he will believe that I have not done so intentionally. At any rate, it must be admitted, that the reason given by my right rev. friend coincides very remarkably with what I have stated of his opinions, for he finds no fault with the extent or purport of the noble Duke's notice; he only says it has come too late for one who had found it necessary to make up his mind some time before. No doubt my right rev. friend had so made up his mind; but why it was necessary for him to do so, I cannot conceive; and yet I am quite sure that the necessity, which is felt by such a mind as his, is something very strong. Be this as it may, I should have thought it time enough for him to have made up his mind, when the Bill was before the House, and when the question to be decided really pressed for decision; but he has anticipated that period—for very good reasons I am quite sure, though I am at a loss to perceive them. My Lords, I should not have been surprised if any of the noble Lords on this (the Ministerial) side of the House, had wished to get rid of this notice of the noble Duke, which must be felt by them as very inconvenient. But I should have thought that, to any one entertaining the opinions expressed by my right rev. friend, and who had read the Bill which I hold in my hand, the noble Duke's notice would have been the most acceptable thing possible, because it affords the very best means of getting out of all the difficulty which such a person must feel. It ensures the object he has in view, the real extent of Reform which he thinks necessary, and offers to deliver him from the dangers which he sees in this Bill. But, my Lords, it is time for me to apply myself to the real question before the House—and what is this question?—It is, whether we will consent to the second reading of the Bill; in other words, whether we will approve and adopt its principle. Now, is the principle of the Bill such as is fit to be adopted by this House? especially, is it such as can merit the approbation of all the noble Lords and right rev. Prelates, who have expressed their opinions on the limits within which a safe measure of Reform must be bounded? Very far otherwise. It is very true that we have not yet very clearly ascertained what the real principle of the Bill is; and to this point I will now beg leave to address my attention. We have been told by the noble Earl, who moved the second reading of the Bill, that the principle of it is declared in the preamble. That preamble states the expediency of taking 'effec- 'tual measures for correcting divers abuses 'that have long prevailed in the choice of 'Members to serve in the Commons' 'House of Parliament, to deprive many 'inconsiderable places of the right of re- 'turning Members, to grant such privi- 'leges to large, populous, and wealthy 'towns, to increase the number of Knights 'of the Shire, to extend the elective fran- 'chise to many of his Majesty's subjects 'who have not heretofore enjoyed the same, 'and to diminish the expense of elections.' Now, I certainly think it would be impossible for any person, not previously aware of the fact, to conceive, from this preamble, that the Bill itself would go, not only to the absolute extinction of many rights of representation, not only to the alteration of many others, but to effect a complete and entire change in the whole Representative system, in the rights of election, of every county, city, and borough in England. A change such as this, a change so enormous as was never before contemplated, is not to be expected from the preamble of the Bill; and if so, then I say that that preamble does not express the principle of the Bill. The real principle of the Bill seems to me to be a complete change in our Representative system, except with respect to the Universities. Such a change has, I repeat, never before been contemplated—in my opinion such a change amounts to something very like revolution, and, therefore, the principle of the Bill seems to me to be revolutionary. I am well aware that the account which I before stated has been given, of the principle of the Bill, not only by the noble Earl who introduced it, but also by a noble Earl opposite, who spoke with such distinguished ability and eloquence last night (the Earl of Harrowby). That noble Earl has likewise given you another principle of the Bill: he has told your Lordships that, "if you agree to the second reading of this Bill"—in other words, if you acknowledge the principle of it—"you will admit that some considerable Reform is required in the Commons' House of Parliament." But, my Lords, though we have this very high authority for the statement that such is the principle of the measure, I cannot forget that we have had other principles attributed to it by the noble Earl himself. I am far from wishing to taunt that noble Earl with inconsistency in his views and conduct in respect to this question at different times; for I do not think it matter of blame that a man should be inconsistent with himself with respect to so vast a subject. A question of this kind involves so many considerations, it must appear at different times in so many different lights to the same man, that a change in his opinions is not to be wondered at. I fully believe that nothing but the conviction of the wisdom and necessity of assenting now to this very same measure which the noble Earl, six months since, thought it wise and necessary to oppose, could have induced the noble Earl to give it his support. But while I fully admit that voting differently at different times with regard to questions of this nature, does not necessarily imply blameable inconsistency, I am sure that the noble Earl will, on his part, admit that (though a different line of action may be now necessary, in respect to this Bill, though he may now feel it his duty to support the second reading, which he then opposed) yet, what he expressed of the principle of the Bill, on the 4th of October last in opposing it, cannot be less applicable to it this night, when he thinks it proper to give it his support. In short, my Lords, truth and reason will stand still, even though the noble Earl may have felt it necessary to turn round. Now, in opening this morning the speech delivered by the noble Earl last October, in opposition to this measure, the first sentence that my eye fell upon was the following—"The principle and object of this Bill are to make the Constitution more democratic. Look to the consequences of doing so." Again, in another place—"I am obliged to oppose this Bill, as I consider it a change which must inevitably lead to all other changes." And, in a third instance, he says, 'I think that much of the power 'of a government may rest in the confi- 'dence of the people, and if that confi- 'dence be shaken, be the government in 'reality good or bad, it is the interest and 'the duty of the government to take such 'reasonable measures as suggest them- 'selves to recover that confidence, and 'assure its continuance. That, however, 'is not to be done by changing at once 'the whole constitution of the House of 'Commons.' Here, my Lords, is the description given by the noble Earl of the principle of the Bill in October last; it is "to make the Constitution more democratic"—it is to effect "a change, which must necessarily lead to all other changes"—it is "to change at once the whole constitution of the House of Commons"—and if this was its principle then, it is not less its principle now. I assent most completely to this view of the principle, and, therefore, I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill. My Lords, I have already said, that I regard this measure as revolutionary. I know that the noble Earl at the head of the Government has repelled this charge against the measure with indignation. I am glad that it was thought a charge, and that it was so answered; for I should think it very frightful if the noble Earl thought lightly of producing a revolution. But the noble Earl took a distinction which, he thought justified himself. He said, that "that was not a revolution which was not either a change of dynasty, or some other change that was wrought, not by the regular powers of the Constitution, but by the introduction of some force unknown to the Constitution." From the silence of the noble Earl, I trust I have quoted his words correctly. But if such are the noble Earl's notions of revolution, they are very different from mine. According to those notions, it follows, that no revolution occurred in France before the year 1792, and not till Louis 16th fled from Paris; for, up to that period, vast as were the changes that took place, all, or almost all, were brought about under the forms of law, and by the regular powers of the Constitution. ["*No! no!*"] I trust that noble Lords will have the goodness to correct me hereafter, if I am wrong. Meanwhile, I persist in my assertion, and I believe that it will hardly be disputed, that every portion of the French Revolution, up to June, 1792—every thing that was done before that period in the way of destroying the ancient institutions of the country—was done under the forms of the Constitution, and by the regularly-constituted powers of the Government of that country. Now, let us suppose for a moment, that in this country a vast change was introduced by both Houses of Parliament, and sanctioned by the King—a change which went to destroy the present existing system altogether. Let us suppose, for instance, that the two Houses of Parliament were base enough to pass a Bill, to which the Sovereign gave his assent, making all the proclamations of the King equivalent to Acts of Parliament. Would it be said, if such a thing as this should be done, that it would not amount to a revolution? And yet it would be a change accomplished under the regular forms of the Constitution, and sanctioned by the constituted authorities of the State. We might suppose, also, a contrary case. Let us suppose, that a sovereign, anxious for popularity, and thinking to gratify the wishes of his subjects, should descend from his throne, and with the consent of Parliament, so change all the forms of the government as to establish a republic, or a monarchy which would be one only in name and form, with all the essentials of a real republic—this would be a change brought about by the recognized constitutional authorities of the land; and yet, would any one say, that such a change would not amount to a complete revolution? But this, it may be said, is putting extreme cases. Well, then, I will put another, which, a twelvemonth ago, we should all have thought an extreme one, too—but which, after what we have recently heard, within these twenty-four hours, from a noble Baron may, I fear, be so regarded no longer. Let us suppose, my Lords, that some measure were devised, the object of which should be to drown the voice of your Lordships, and to extinguish for ever the independence of this House—let us suppose this to be done, in all due form, by the exercise of powers fully recognized by law—and thus, my Lords, a third case would occur, of which, I apprehend, most of your Lordships would agree in opinion with me, that it amounts to a revolution. [*Interruption.*] I must say that it is extremely inconvenient to receive lessons in this way while I am addressing your Lordships. I am well aware that severe lessons will be read to me by-and-by—and then I shall bear them as I may. Meanwhile, I entreat that I may not be interrupted. After all, my Lords, however disagreeable may be the mention of the word revolution to the ears polite of the noble Lords on the Bench near me, I must remind them that some of the chief supporters of the Bill glory in it, because it is a revolutionary measure, and advocate it as such. We all know that the public Press have given great support to this Bill; and we are equally aware that, by the public Press, it is hailed as a revolution. In one of the public Journals—in a Journal conducted with great ability, remarkable for its great information, and distinguished for the efficient support which it has given to this measure—in that Journal I not long ago read the following words, as characterizing the Constitution of this land—"That horrid old mockery of a free government which we have hitherto been enduring." This is the description of the existing Constitution, given in that public Journal which has rendered the most powerful support to this measure, and which is believed by many to breathe the inspirations, if not of the Treasury itself, at least of some high office or offices, of the Government. I do not say that this belief is well founded—I do not say that I believe it—I only say that such a charge has been made, and that it is believed by many to be true. [*It is not true.*] I have only said what is believed by many—not that I believe it. This, I repeat, is the description of a Constitution—of which Englishmen have been wont to be proud—given by one of the ablest supporters of the present Bill. I find no fault with it: on the contrary, I honour the frankness of the avowal. To think and speak thus is exactly what might be expected from an honest and intelligent advocate of the plan My lords, I will not inflict on your Lordships any eulogy—or, rather, I fear I should say any elegy—of mine, on our departing Constitution, but I will indulge myself with speaking of it in the lofty language in which Milton describes a complete and generous education. My Lords, for more ages than I shall stop to number. the British Constitution has "fitted the people of this land to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the duties, both private and public, of peace and war." This, in my heart, I believe to be true of our present Constitution. Such, in my heart, I believe the British Constitution to be; and, believing it to be so, no earthly consideration shall induce me, by any vote of mine, to contribute to its destruction. I do not mean to go into the details of this Bill; I shall rather look to its general character—and, looking at it thus, I am so forcibly struck by one of the things said of it by the noble Earl opposite, that I must take the liberty of enlarging a little upon it. I allude, my Lords, to that part of the noble Earl's former speech, in which he spoke of the democratic tendency of this measure. My Lords, I am not disposed to be making comparisons between the different elements in the existing Constitution; but I have no hesitation in saying, that I consider the democratic element the most glorious and the most valuable of all. I consider it to be the perennial source of that spirit of liberty which is the proudest distinction of our national character—the boast and glory of our country; but while I feel it to be so valuable, I, at the same time feel that it is a principle which peculiarly requires to be restrained. Like that element in the physical world which it most resembles—the element of fire—it is, while properly tempered and controlled, the most genial, the most salutary, the most invigorating, the most productive of all good; but like that element, also, when left to its own unchecked and uncorrected workings, it becomes the most destructive and the most devastating. In the Constitution, as it at present exists, I find that the democratic element has such checks and corrections as reduce it to a due temperament, and render it a safe and inestimable ingredient of the whole. These checks and corrections are found in parts of the Constitution, which I fairly own at first sight appear to be the least worthy of approbation, and the most exposed to objection—I mean the nomination and close boroughs. They have been called by a noble Earl this night—and I do not wish to quarrel with the expression—the rotten parts of the Constitution. A great man, deceased, did not regard them in that light; he distinguished them by a phrase, certainly not of honour, but one which recognizes their importance and necessity—he called them the shameful parts of the Constitution. Such parts of the Constitution are not the least necessary to the soundness of the whole; and if those boroughs perform the distinctive functions which Mr. Burke says they do perform, and for which he valued them, then I contend, that they ought not to be got rid of without some equivalent check of a more seemly character. If that can be done, I shall rejoice in their abolition; but, seeing no such correctives in the present Bill, I feel myself bound to adhere to the old system, or, at least, not to go so far in innovation as is proposed in the measure before the House. In connexion with this part of the subject, there is one point to which I beg leave to recall your Lordships' attention. We have heard much of usurpations on the rights of the people; usurpations that have been committed either by Members of this House, or by other wealthy proprietors. It is said that some of your Lordships have, in fact, usurped a power over the Representation which particularly belonged to the people. That this has, in some instances, occurred, I readily admit; that it has occurred so often as is charged, I must beg leave respectfully to deny. There is no period, I will venture to say, in the ancient history of the Parliament of this country, in which it has not been the practice of the Government to create boroughs which should absolutely be in the nomination of great proprietors. I believe I may say with truth, that all those boroughs, the franchise of which is burgage-tenure, are of this description. Now, when these usurpations on the rights of the people are charged upon Members of this House, and upon the great proprietors, I beg to be permitted to ask, whether there has been no usurpation on the part of the people on the rights of Parliament? There has been one gigantic usurpation, in comparison with which all others sink into insignificance—I mean the publicity which is given to the proceedings of Parliament by the printing of the debates in both Houses. This usurpation upon the privileges of both Houses of Parliament is far greater, and far more important in its operation, than all those ten times told which have been charged against any of your Lordships, or any other great proprietors, as regards any interference in the election of Representatives of the Commons in Parliament. Nothing, I apprehend, can be more certain than that, by the letter and spirit of the Constitution of this country, the proceedings in the two Houses of Parliament are to be free from all influence from without, and, therefore, it is that we are presumed to be now discussing this question with closed doors. Do I lament that the practice has been changed? Far from it. I think that the publicity given to our proceedings is the most wholesome measure that could have been adopted. I think it the best and most complete Reform of Parliament ever devised; because, I think that no greater security can be given for the purity of conduct of both Houses, than that all we do, and all we say, should be known to the whole world. Thus, it has happened, that while the people have not so large a direct influence on the proceedings of Parliament as a less restrained system of Representation might afford them, still everything is done to give them a real and efficient influence. But if, in order to correct the excess of the power of the Members of this House, or of other great proprietors over the Representation—if, in order to correct this excess, a new measure were introduced, which would abolish the balance hitherto maintained—which would destroy altogether the influence of Peers and great proprietors over the Constitution of the other House, making all elections popular—but, which, at the same time, would allow the publication of the proceedings of Parliament to be continued—if, I say, to correct the excess complained of, such a course were adopted, then would the democratic element of the Constitution obtain so vast and overwhelming a preponderance, that everything else must give way to it, and it would be impossible to carry on any regular system of government. In short, my Lords, thinking as I do that it is necessary as the best protection of the purity of our own proceedings, and for the satisfaction of the people, that access should be had, not only to the votes, but to the debates of Parliament, I could never consent to any measure which would exclude the public from these walls. But then, I must insist on the necessity of bearing this important consideration in mind, when we are meditating Reform, when we are discussing what shall be the new Constitution of the country; and we should take care, while we permit the people irregularly to avail themselves of an advantage of the most important kind, not so to increase their regular power, as must positively overwhelm the monarchical and aristocratical elements of the Constitution. My Lords, there is one part of the subject to which I beg leave to thank the noble Baron, who spoke with such extraordinary ability and eloquence two nights ago (Lord Ellenborough), and also the noble Earl at the Table (the Earl of Falmouth) for having directed our attention—I mean the connexion of this Bill with that for the Reform of the Representation of Ireland. As the noble Earl well and truly said, the present measure, and the two Bills now before the other House, must be considered as parts and parcels of the same measure. They are intregal parts of one whole; and I am quite sure that none of your Lordships would ask me to consider them separately, or would suppose that I am guilty of any irregularity in alluding to the Irish measure of Reform, although that measure is not yet before us, and in speaking of it and of the English Bill, as one and the same conjoint measure. I say this the more confidently, because I have the example and the authority of the noble Earl at the head of the Government for so doing; for the noble Earl, in submitting this measure to the House, spoke of the Irish Bill, and told us what was the number of additional Representatives which it was proposed to give to Ireland. Now, of course, the noble Earl could only have done this from recognizing its connexion with the present measure. Sanctioned, then, by this authority, and following the course of the noble Earl, I shall not scruple to make one or two remarks upon the Bill for Ireland, as taken in connexion with that now before the House. In the first place, then, if the Irish Bill should be carried, what will become of the Representation of the Irish boroughs? It will be taken from the Protestant influence, and conferred upon the Roman Catholic population. Can your Lordships conceive a greater change—a more important change—a more fearful change? It appears to me to be the more formidable, because I cannot disguise from myself that it is only one part of that system, which unhappily of late has been too much practised, of truckling to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. I see that, on every occasion, there is a readiness to yield the most high and sacred considerations connected with the religion of that country to temporal—nay, to temporary expediency. Expediency! My Lords; it is not expediency. The thing is as miserable in policy as it is indefensible in principle. It is a mere huckstering of pure religion for the brief, the hollow, the worthless support of men whom no concessions can win—who laugh at your bribes, and jeer at your elaborate and unwearied efforts to cocker, and soothe, and pamper them—of men who no longer deign even to wear the mask of a decent hypocrisy, who proclaim their hopes—rather, I should say, their triumphs—of men who even now boast—and chuckle while they boast—that the oath they have taken not to use the power which a too confiding Legislature gave them "to weaken or disturb the Protestant Government, or Protestant religion of the country"—admits of an explanation, which makes it a key—a picklock—with which they may open to themselves, at once, both the citadel and the temple of our Sion. My Lords, I speak not of visionary dangers, or matters of distant and doubtful speculation. Already the days of the Irish branch of the Protestant Church are numbered. The very month of its destruction has been openly, ostentatiously, authoritatively proclaimed. It has been declared that a general election will take place in November next, and at that general election the giant spirit of democracy will rise in all its might, and crush the Protestant Church of Ireland to the dust. This high purpose has been proclaimed—not by some mad fanatic at the Rotunda, in Dublin—not by some artful demagogue or unprincipled agitator, seeking to inflame the passions of a mob for the advancement of the sordid views of his own miserable ambition, or more miserable avarice. No! it has been proclaimed by a British Senator, in a place second in dignity only to the Assembly which I have now the honour of addressing, by a man of genius and of eloquence, by a man who was not long ago selected by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—aye, and not unworthy on many accounts, to be so selected—to represent the principles of that noble Lord in Parliament. This Gentleman, my Lords, whose fortunes and whose principles alike place him above the temptation of sordid lucre, and whose high faculties—for he has very high faculties—had found a full and adequate object of their ambition in the peaceful honours of the senate and of the bar—this Gentleman, after having laid down all hostility to our Church—after having solemnly, and I doubt not sincerely, pledged himself to promote, with all his powers, the common peace and common security of all his countrymen—has been forced and goaded by the measure on which we are this night to decide, to abandon that peaceful course—to resume the port and attitude of combat, to arm himself in the cause of his Church—his now, as it is fondly deemed, triumphant Church. And while his better feelings recoil at the work before him, while he vainly struggles against the chain which binds him, he is compelled again to take the impulse of all his public conduct from the mandate of his spiritual taskmaster. In relation to this part of the question—I mean the Irish measure of Reform—there is a matter which I beg leave very earnestly to lay before your Lordships—I mean the origin of the system of Representation in Ireland. I am persuaded that it is not unknown to any of your Lordships that, the Representative system in Ireland owes its origin to King James 1st. He established that system not as an equal system, but avowedly as unequal. The circumstances of Ireland—its condition—the relation in which it stood towards this country—forbade the introduction of an impartial system of Representation to our own. The system established by King James 1st was formed for a small band of Englishmen settled in the midst of a hostile population—a population opposed to them in all that related to civil rights, as well as to religious feelings. Under such circumstances, King James 1st felt that it was impossible that anything like a regular government could be kept up in that country, unless either the Roman Catholic natives were treated as slaves, or the Protestant settler had a predominant power in Parliament. For this reason, he openly avowed in the proclamation which he set forth at the time, and by which he created a large number of boroughs in Ireland, and divided some of the provinces into new counties, that his object in doing so was to establish a system by which the Protestant interest and the Protestant Church of Ireland should be secured. Such, my Lords, was the policy of James—such the foundation of the Representative system of Ireland. Within our recollection two epochs have occurred, at which, the Representation of that country has undergone considerable change. I mean the Legislative Union of Ireland with this country, and the recent settlement of the question with respect to the disabilities of the Roman Catholics. On both those occasions, it was decided that the Protestant interest in the Representation of boroughs should be retained. In the words of the Treaty of Union, the maintenance of the Protestant Church was considered as an essential and fundamental principle in the government of the country. For that reason, it was stipulated that certain boroughs should be retained, and the corporations of those boroughs were continued in the state in which they were, under their ancient charters, for the very purpose of securing the Protestant interest. In the measure adopted three years ago—the measure for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics—that part of the Protestant security was left untouched. It was stated by the noble Duke, in bringing that measure forward, as a thing absolutely essential to the good faith of this country—to the good faith of a Protestant Government, dealing with Protestant interests—that in making the change which he proposed, the Protestant boroughs of Ireland should be continued in their existing state. Is there, then, one of your Lordships who, if told at that time, that, within three years, it would be proposed to do away with this security which was then so sedulously and carefully preserved—is there, I ask, one of your Lordships who would not have scouted the idea? And yet, it is so proposed in the measure now before us—a measure, the principle of which, has received the assent of many noble Lords, who, I believe,' are as firmly attached to the Protestant interests as myself—which has received the assent, too, of some of my right rev. brethren. Now, I confess, that this has somewhat astonished me, because it is impossible, I think, for any man not to be aware of the connexion between the English and Irish Reform Bills, and, consequently, of the results which must follow the adoption of the first. I do not wish to state this too strongly, but, I should be wanting to the duty which I owe to the Church, in which I bear so high an office, if I did not further state that there is something in this question of a very peculiar interest as respects the highest individual in the realm.

---

* From the corrected edition by Murray.

To the security of the Protestant interests—to the security of the Protestant Church—it is not only our duty, as Members of the British Parliament, to pay particular attention, but, it is also the particular duty of the Sovereign himself. In discussing this subject we must not forget that, by the oath which sealed the compact between the Sovereign and the people, and which we had all the happiness of seeing his present gracious Majesty take with such interesting and imposing ceremonies, a few months ago—you must not forget, I say, that, by that oath, the Sovereign bound himself to maintain, to the utmost of his power, the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant reformed religion, as by law established, within these realms. Looking upon the subject in this light, I wish to put it to the noble Lords who sit on the bench near me—not in a tone of defiance (which would ill become me), nor in the spirit of defiance (which, I hope does not belong to me)—but calmly, and with a deep sense of its overwhelming importance, I wish to ask those noble Lords whether, they can conceal from themselves, on due consideration, that the plain, simple, indisputable meaning of this oath, must prevent the Sovereign from consenting to extinguish the Protestant power, which is retained in the existing corporations in Ireland. I put this, I say, to the consideration of those noble Lords. But I must beg leave to remind the House that Ministers are not the only responsible persons on this occasion. I must be permitted to remind your Lordships that each and every one of you is equally bound, not only not to consent himself to a measure of this sort, but not to aid in forcing it upon the counsels of the Sovereign. If I say this to the House at large, what must I say to my right rev. brethren in particular? Will they—will any man among them, if he really thinks that I have fairly stated the case—will he venture to sanction, by his vote this night, such a measure as this before us? I am sure that, not one of my rev. brethren will do so. I am sure that, whatever pledges they may have given, they will see that no pledge can relieve them from the solemn duty of protecting the Sovereign's oath, and the interests of the Protestant Church. Having had this matter brought before their minds—even in the poor way in which it has been laid before them by myself—if, after this, they support the Bill, they will do so, I am sure, because they do not see the case, as I most conscientiously avow, that it is seen by me. Nothing, I am confident, could prevail on them to vote for this Bill, if they thought, as I think, that, by voting for it, they will sacrifice one great security of the Protestant cause in Ireland. I have already trespassed at too great a length upon your Lordships' time; I hasten, therefore, to conclude. My Lords, it is with no ordinary feeling that I find myself speaking upon this subject in this the most august assembly in the world—aye, I repeat it, in this the most august assembly in the world. Such, this House for centuries has been—such it still is—such let us hope it may long continue to be. God grant that it may; for, if it should ever cease to be the most august assembly in the world, it will become the most degraded. And why, my Lords, will this be? beause, if this House shall fall from its proud eminence, it will fall not by violence from without; for, notwithstanding all that has been said or done, the people of this country will never be so false to their own interests, as to be wanting in respectful attachment to you, if you are not wanting to yourselves and them. No, my Lords, if this House shall fall from its palmy state, it will fall by corruption within. It will fall by the folly, or the guilt, by the cowardice, or the treachery, of some, if there shall be any such, of its own degenerate Members. My Lords, it has been ordained by a severe, but most merciful dispensation, that those to whom great interests are intrusted, cannot be false to those interests, without drawing down a full measure of righteous retribution on their own heads. My Lords, to you the guardianship of the British Constitution—that Constitution which, for at least 800 years, has fostered, nursed, matured, and consolidated the liberties and the happiness of this much-favoured people—to you the guardianship of that Constitution has been mainly consigned, to your fidelity, to your prudence, to your firmness. My Lords, if it fall, you will not only fall with it, but you will be ground to dust beneath its ruins. May He who has appointed you to your high place, enable you to fill it as you ought! In this great crisis, (for so we all feel it to be)—in this agony of our country's fate—may He give you wisdom to see, and fortitude to pursue steadily and fearlessly, that only path which can lead to honour or to safety—the path of duty. True, my Lords, that path is beset with difficulties and with dangers; clouds and thickest darkness rest upon it: but one thing is clear, is bright, and one thing only—to walk uprightly is within your own power. As for consequences, they are in the power of God. Will you distrust that power? My Lords, you will not.

The Bishop of *Llandaff* said, he merely rose to protest against the necessity or even the propriety of arguing the present question with reference to a supposed connexion between this Bill and the Reform Bill intended for Ireland. It did not follow, for a moment, that he who favoured the one must, of necessity, be pledged to support the other. He should, therefore, conscientiously give his vote for the second reading of the Bill then before the House; and yet he should feel himself to be perfectly at liberty hereafter to vote as his judgment might direct him, with regard to the other Bill. If the description which the right rev. Prelate gave of that other Bill turned out to be correct, then he would vote against it as stoutly, and raise his voice against it as loudly, as the right rev. Prelate himself would do. Many of those who, last Session, voted against the second reading of the Reform Bill, did so in order to obtain time for consideration; and now, after six months of preparation, they had come to a decision to support the second reading of the Bill. It was with feelings deeply painful that he gave his vote on that occasion. He, however, looked to the situation of the country, and he conceived that the safer course would be, to take time for proper consideration. That feeling induced him to give his negative to the Motion. He did so, knowing that if he were wrong, a remedy existed which might be applied hereafter, but that if the measure were carried, and that mischief resulted from it, no mode would be left to remove the evil. This was sufficient to influence a mind so balanced as his was. Another, and a powerful reason, which weighed with him, and one that could not have been overlooked by his right rev. friend was, that even the most prominent Members of both Houses of Parliament, who had opposed the measure, held one common sentiment, and agreed in one common principle—namely, that some Reform was necessary. It was almost a proverbial sentiment throughout the country, that something must be done. It was, therefore, he contended, prudent to consider the measure which was proposed to be the law of the land. A sound argument, in his mind, for formerly voting against the Bill was, that due time should be given for consideration, that the pulse of the country might be felt, in order that they might ascertain whether the call for Reform originated in a feverish feeling, or in a strong and decided conviction of its necessity. An interval of six months had fully proved to them that this feeling was not temporary, but that it was a during and firm resolution arising from the conviction that there were great grievances in the country which this Bill would remedy. The measure now came again before them, freed from many objections which were originally made to it. Perhaps something more might be done to render the measure more generally acceptable. This being the state of the case, he thought that they had no alternative but to take the Bill into their most serious consideration. In so doing, he did not pledge himself to support what might be viewed by others as essential parts of the measure, if they did not meet the conviction of his own mind. He trusted, therefore, that a candid construction would be put on the conduct of those who, under the circumstances which he had stated, meant to vote for the second reading. By so doing they declared their approbation of the principle of the measure, under the peculiar circumstances of the country, leaving the Committee to make such alterations in the details of the Bill as they might conceive to be necessary. Reserving to himself that discretion, he felt perfectly clear in his conscience when he gave his vote for the second reading of the Bill. He trusted that a spirit of conciliation would pervade both sides, and that a general disposition would be manifested to take such steps as would be best calculated to tranquillize and quiet the country.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, that after all the arguments which had been adduced in support of the Bill now under their Lordships' consideration, he should think himself ill-justified in trespassing at much length on their attention, by entering into a detailed examination of the general principle on which the measure proceeded. But he must be permitted, in that place, and at the period at which the discussion had now arrived, to state his opinion on what had been advanced in the course of the debate, in opposition to this Bill, which now, for the second time, had been sent up to their Lordships, by the Commons of the United Kingdom, for their consideration. In adverting to those observations, it was not his purpose, and he did not feel it to be his duty, to inquire how far the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Lincoln) who spoke first on that side of the House to-night, and who so clearly, so satisfactorily, and, above all, so calmly, and so candidly, stated his intention of supporting the second reading of this Bill, on the ground of the great change which had been effected in the country—he would not stop to inquire whether that right rev. Prelate had taken an unwise or improper course, in not having taken into his councils the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Exeter) who had spoken last but one, and who had advanced many arguments in opposition to the measure. Perhaps, after he had heard the panegyric which that right rev. Prelate had pronounced on the plan proposed by the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) he might have found some good reasons for not taking the advice of the right rev. Prelate, if it had been offered. The right rev. Prelate had, at great length, stated his view of the subject, and he was certainly much surprised to find him acting the part of a recruiting officer, and endeavouring to win over supporters to the proposed measure of the noble Duke. No doubt the right rev. Prelate did this with all that sincerity which was well known to belong to him. He should come presently to some observations made by that right rev. Prelate, with respect to the character and extent of change proposed by this measure; but first of all, he wished to say, in the outset, with respect to himself, that he agreed entirely with the right rev. Prelate—that he agreed with the noble Duke opposite, who last night expressed his hostility to the Bill—that he agreed with the noble Lord on the cross-benches, (Lord Gage), who, the preceding night, had given his reluctant assent to the second reading of the Bill—he agreed with them completely in their observations, that a most weighty responsibility did rest on those with whom this important measure originated. A great responsibility rested on his noble friend, on himself, and on all those who formed the present Government, in bringing forward this measure—a responsibility only inferior to that which would have attached to individuals who, filling the situation of King's Ministers, and placed in that situation at the period when he and his noble and hon. friends were placed in it, should have silently contemplated, and without any efforts to prevent or counteract it, that gradual estrangement which was taking place amongst those classes of this country, on the continuance of the harmonious connexion between whom depended the prosperity of the country, and more especially the stability of that hierarchy to which the right rev. Prelate was so strongly and so properly attached. The irritation in the public mind which was last night alluded to by a noble Baron—an irritation which threatened an alienation of the middle classes of society from those with whom they had been formerly connected in kind and friendly ties—that irritation, if not allayed, was likely to lead to consequences that would involve the political safety—nay, the political existence, of the State. Now he should have felt contempt for himself—he should have felt contempt (if it were possible to feel such an emotion towards his noble friend)—but he should, even for him, have felt a contempt, if his noble friend had shrunk from the difficult, but necessary task, of endeavouring to heal those wounds—of endeavouring to cement those connexions which every day were more and more dividing and separating. The Ministers, he was proud to say, cared not for the transitory dignity of office: they were ready to sacrifice that—they were ready to sacrifice personal comfort and happiness; all they wished, all they strove for was, to restore the Constitution, and, by restoring it, to give additional strength, stability, and prosperity, to every part of the empire. The right rev. Prelate had declared that this measure was a revolution. He denied the assertion. It was not a revolution. According to the idea of the right rev. Prelate, his description of revolution would apply to some of the most important and most beneficial changes that had ever been made in the institutions of this country. It had been well stated by a noble Lord who spoke early in this debate—a noble Lord who had been lately introduced to the House, by that great act of justice which had been delayed too long—it had been stated by him, with as much truth as eloquence, that of all the absurdities that ever could be imagined, that of an immutable state of the law, in a mutable state of things, was the most absurd. Change and alteration were incidental to the condition of the world. Changes were constantly taking place in every portion of society; and it was, therefore, necessary, from time to time, that well-considered alterations should be made in the working of the Constitution, in order to meet those various changes. It was by the careful, by the deliberate, and by the effectual application of such alterations, that it was possible for ours, or any other political system, to bear up against the perpetual inroads which time must necessarily make upon it. Here he begged leave to state, that as a noble Marquis had said, he was not prepared to found any change that was proposed, as well on new doctrines, as on new circumstances. What he asked for was, to examine how far new circumstances required the application of old doctrines. That was all that he and his friends asked. They wished to go back to the elements of the Constitution. Now he would demand of the noble Lords opposite, whether there was anything contrary to the principles of the Constitution in the extension of the right of voting to those places which had become the depositories of that knowledge, and the possessors of that influence on society, which the wisdom and policy of this Government had always endeavoured to attach to itself; or whether there was anything opposed to the acknowledged principle of the Constitution, in disfranchising small and insignificant places, and enfranchising others of great and growing extent and importance. The great and primary elements of the Constitution of this country were to be traced to one basis, that of securing, by every proper means, the happiness and security of the country. And how was that to be done? Certainly by making such alterations, from time to time, in the system of Government, as circumstances rendered necessary. There were no other means of preserving the Constitution. If they looked to other countries, as well as this, they would find those countries endeavouring to acquire fresh strength, by taking a wise and due advantage of new circumstances. He would point the attention of their Lordships to the constitution of another country—a constitution far more democratic than our own—he alluded to the constitution of the United States of America. He could assure noble Lords that he was not going to call on them to adopt that Constitution. All he meant to do was, to point out the course which had been pursued in that country with respect to an extension of the elective right; and he would say, that if the great men—for great men he would call them—who established that Constitution, had prevented the means of accession to the new States which were continually growing up in America, there would have been, in a very short time, an end to that Constitution. Accession was, however, admitted; and the consequence was, that the power of the United States had increased more than imagination had previously contemplated. He, therefore, entreated their Lordships to recollect, that even in the bosom of a single society, new and great interests might arise; and if so, was it not necessary and proper, as they came into existence, to make alterations in the system to meet the change of circumstances? Let the right rev. Prelate, who looked upon the proposed change as amounting to revolution, let him look to history, which was open to all. Let him look to our own history, and he would find the system of legislation had been gradually altered, and previously independent Legislatures wholly swept away. Was the Union with Scotland revolution? Was the Union with Ireland revolution? The right rev. Prelate doubtless would say, that in neither case a revolution had been effected; and yet, in each of these instances, it was deemed politic, for the general good, to make a far more sweeping change than would be effected by this Bill. The right rev. Prelate had adverted to the French Revolution. That Revolution originated in violence. And why? Because there was no Parliament in that country, to consider the complaints of the people; because there was no Parliament there, to mark the change which had taken place in the popular mind and feeling; because there was no Parliament there, to warn the Church, and to warn the nobility of their danger. That Revolution was begun in blood, and it proceeded to take its fearful course, in consequence of the want of that very feeling—that feeling which induced Ministers to listen to the complaints of the people—which the right rev. Prelate was anxious to oppose. A noble Baron, who spoke on the first night of the debate, was led, in the course of his argument, to make the very admission which he (the Marquis of Lansdown) and his friends required for the adoption of this Bill. It appeared to be a favourite idea with the noble Baron, that the colonial interests should be allowed the benefit of Representation. He said, "What signifies antiquity to me? The colonies have grown powerful and wealthy, and ought to be represented." The noble Baron was ready to allow the colonies to have Representation, by an undue path; but with what propriety could he refuse to give Representation by a due and direct path, to the great towns of England which required Representation as much as the colonies? He agreed with the noble Baron, in some degree, that it was desirable the colonies should be represented, and he should be prepared to concur in a measure having that object in view, had not nature opposed obstacles to such a plan, which made it perfectly impracticable. But it appeared to him perfectly obvious, since they could not give them direct Representation, that the next best thing they could do for the colonies—the next best chance they could give them of having something like an imperfect Representation—was to give Representation to those places which were particularly connected with the colonies; and such places they found in the outports which either already sent Members or were to send Members to Parliament under the Bill before the House. The colonies would always have that influence in those out-ports which community of interest naturally gave a consumer with a producer. The Representatives of those places would feel it their interest to attend to the welfare of the colonies, as upon the continuance of their prosperity must of course depend the continuance of the prosperity of the ports which traded with them. The noble Baron, in stating his objections to this Bill, wished, naturally enough, to disarm the formidable array he was obliged to admit was in favour of this measure out of doors, if not within it. He the more particularly dwelt upon the general view the noble Baron then proceeded to take of that array, because the noble Duke attached so much importance to it that he also last night made a sort of *catalogue raisonnée* of the supporters of the measure. First, there was the great Whig Aristocracy, who the noble Baron conceived it perfectly obvious must have motives for supporting this measure more dear to them than the maintenance and transmission to their families of those honours and properties which they possessed. The noble Baron next challenged the whole body of the Catholics of Ireland, and said, that they also ought not to sit in judgment upon this measure. Then came the Radicals and the Dissenters, and the well-known Reformers of England, who, ever since the year 1792, had always been so ready to advocate every change, and they also were challenged; but, even after the noble Baron had thus put out of his chalice all these noxious ingredients, he was obliged to admit, and candidly did admit, that there still remained a great residuum with which he did not know how to deal. It was composed, he admitted, of very honest people of every class and rank in the community, who had got into their heads a strange idea that Reform was necessary, and whose opinion, constituting as it did public opinion, was entitled to respect. Now, why had not such a body, constituting the wholesome part of the community in the opinion of the noble Baron, himself attached to the cause of Reform, been separated from those whom he conceived to be the ultra-Reformers by some sort of provision, calculated to conciliate them, made by the noble Baron and the noble Duke in the course of the last two years? If they had taken that view of the state of society, which had now been explained by them, was it not an obvious course, if they conceived danger likely to arise from the mixture of this pure body with the tainted part of the community—was it not, he said, an obvious course to take security against that danger by providing, long before this period, for the feeling which had been growing up amongst them, by introducing a gradual Reform, which, if introduced in time, might have succeeded, but which, let him remind the noble Marquis opposite, had been constantly and systematically opposed by him whenever the opportunity of acting upon it had occurred. He was bound to say, that, if they were now obliged to go to a greater extent than might formerly have been necessary, it was because the noble Lord opposite, and those who acted with him, had stifled in the germ every attempt at such a Reform, till at last, the King, the Commons, and the people, all cried aloud for a measure of Reform, which they had not known, like wise Statesmen, how to guard against. But now, at this eleventh hour, when every plan to stop the progress of this measure had failed—when it had passed the other House of Parliament—when, after one Bill had been rejected by their Lordships, this measure was at last, upon the very verge of meeting—he would not say possessed some chance of receiving, because he trusted it was a certainty of receiving—their Lordships' approbation, a reforming light suddenly burst forth from the head of the noble Duke opposite who knew—what, perhaps, they all could not know—the great pains of labour it had cost to produce that conception. Some rumours had, indeed, reached them, from time to time, of Statesmen and Members of Parliament, and of ex-clerks of office, being engaged in laborious attempts to consider how they might effect the least possible change, by the least possible means. They had heard, too, occasionally, of the projects, of the calculations, of the circulations, of the copyings and printings there had been of papers put forth one day and suppressed another; but all, it seemed, had fallen to the ground, to the utter discomfiture of the opponents of the Bill, when the courage or impatience of the noble Duke induced him to bring forward his offspring, to the common parentage of which no one else had yet asserted a claim. The noble Duke had laid his offspring upon their Lordships' Table, in the hope, no doubt, that, if the plan which was now before them should be stripped of its title to the favour of the House, it might be there to claim the attention of the compassionate. But there, whether the present Bill were adopted or rejected, he thought that offspring of the noble Duke would lie for ever. No man should persuade him, after the Commons House of Parliament had twice considered the whole of this subject, and sent up to their Lordships the fruits of their deliberations, that their Lordships would pay so ill a compliment to the House of Commons as to send it back a bill, endorsed with the name of the noble Duke. He only hoped it would merely be the means of inducing their Lordships to reflect, again and again, how impossible the present sense of the country had made it, even to deal with this subject in argument, without having the appearance—for he granted it would be the appearance only—of tendering something, proposed as a substitute for this Bill, which, as his noble friend had so truly stated, whilst it rested upon the very principles of this Bill, would cause dissatisfaction to the persons who, by the Bill now before them, would be pleased. The noble Lord seemed to think that the persons to whom the Bill proposed to communicate the right of voting, were persons quite incapable of making a proper selection of those who ought to represent them. He could not, with the scrupulous and severe accuracy employed by the noble Lord, pronounce that these persons had not produced one man capable of transacting ordinary business; but he imagined that, after a time, if these bodies were incapable of finding among themselves persons of talent capable of representing them (and he thought they would be more fortunate than the noble Baron, who stated that he walked the streets without finding talent), they would be able (he said), at any rate, to go for it to a distance. He must, however, further say, that both the noble Baron, in that very able speech of his, and others, who had spoken in the course of this debate, had pronounced in another respect, rather a harsh and severe judgment on the great body of the householders of this country, who, it must be observed, being in the occupation of a house, even of the lowest degree, to be entitled to take advantages of the provisions of this Bill, must have an income of something like 100*l.* a-year. The noble Lord said, that the majority of these householders were composed of Dissenters, but, even if that were the case, were Dissenters, paying the amount of taxes which they must pay in a house of that description, to be excluded the possession of the franchise, because they were Dissenters? But he was happy to believe, that the noble Baron was misinformed upon this point, for he did not think that the great body of the householders, within twenty miles of the spot from whence they spoke, were Dissenters. Great injustice, however, was done to that body of people, when it was imputed to them that they were likely to be governed in their choice of Representatives by undue factions, or revolutionary motives, and, above all, by any thing like a desire to disturb the tranquillity of the country. In the first place, except in moments of great excitement, which would occasionally prevail in all countries, he had rather observed in that class of persons a disposition to rely upon the judgment of their superiors, particularly when that judgment was not forced upon them. He thought that other noble Lords would concur with him in saying, that they had always shown a disposition to feel flattered on being consulted by their superiors, and, in the end, to rely upon their judgment. But, even if that were not the case, he believed that their choice would be governed by a desire to elect such persons as would advocate measures contributing to the public tranquillity; for, having acquired their property by their own industry, they had as deep a stake in the country as had the noble Baron, who derived a splendid fortune from the talents and services of his immediate progenitor. Their small fortunes were as great objects to them, if not greater, than was the ample income of the noble Baron to himself. Their Lordships might convey away their land, they might go to another country, they might guard themselves, in many ways, against the evils of a revolution, but, to the professional man, who depended upon the peaceable exertions of his talents—to the mechanic, who depended upon his weekly wages—to the annuitant and small proprietor, who depended upon their half-yearly and quarterly incomes—revolution, or even agitation, brought greater ruin than could even come upon their Lordships by the confiscation of their estates. This led him to what the noble Duke had said respecting the spoliation of rights by prescription, which would take place under this measure. Now, let them consider a little what this prescription was. The value of a right by prescription depended upon acquiescence in that prescription: that was to say, that acquiescence made prescription, as it had been justly observed, that obedience made the law. With respect to private property, there was no doubt that prescription was not only as good, but as solemn, a title as any other; for it was no man's interest to question such a title, because he could not thereby appropriate such property to himself; but, when prescription applied to a trust created for the benefit of others, and those for whose benefit it was created questioned the propriety of the prescription, and conceived that the trust was misplaced, the title by prescription lost its force and value, and they were entitled, according to the best theory of the Constitution, and the opinion of the highest authorities, to take that trust into consideration, and, if necessary, to recall it, without a breach of the fundamental principles on which that Constitution rested. The right rev. Prelate who spoke last called upon the House, with great anxiety, to take care not hastily to part with the shameful parts of our Constitution. He stated that he was not unwilling to open their Lordships' doors to the public, and, in his unbounded liberality to the cause of Reform, if he had been consulted, he would have agreed to the addition of galleries to the House, so that a few more of the public might perchance witness its proceedings. That filled up the full measure of the Reform the right rev. Prelate thought necessary; but, after having told them to beware how they dealt with the shameful parts of the Constitution, he told them, in the next sentence, to beware of corruption in that House. He would remind the right rev. Prelate, however, and remind the noble Lord, that all the great writers, all the great statesmen, who had predicted the fall of this Constitution, did it upon the possible corruption of the other House of Parliament: that was, from the continued prevalence of these shameful parts which the right rev. Prelate was so anxious either to leave unrepaired, or to repair by very slow degrees. He was ashamed of having so long detained them, but he implored their Lordships, if they rejected this Bill, to look steadily at the future which they were likely to make for themselves, and to look steadily at the consequences of that act. A noble Lord opposite had said that, of all species of intimidation that was the worst which was founded upon the fear of consequences. Now, he must say, that every Act of Legislation which proposed any great change, either before or since the revolution of 1688 (change being, he admitted, at all times, a great evil), had been founded, by those who recommended it, upon the fear of consequences; and he knew no other consideration which ought to induce a legislature to disturb the constitution of a country, or that quiet which it was undoubtedly the interest of every man to have maintained. It was admitted on all hands that a considerable change was necessary, and accordingly a Bill proposing one—certainly not founded on any new democratic notions, because noble Lords well knew that the prevailing democratic notions went to an extent infinitely beyond what this Bill proposed—was now brought before them. All that this Bill did was, even in the towns selected for new representation, to give the franchise to about one-third of their householders. A Bill, then, had been sent up to them resting upon that limited extension of the suffrage, along with the principles of disfranchisement and enfranchisement. It was upon these principles that any thing that pretended to be an effectual plan of Reform must be founded; and the question now was, whether, after the long-continued deliberations in the House of Commons, their Lordships would, by their vote upon this Motion, rejecting the Bill, do that which could only be construed by the country as a rejection of Reform altogether, as an expression of determination not even to give the plan that consideration which was necessary to enable their Lordships to amend it if they thought fit, in Committee. He could not permit himself to believe that, in the face of the House of Commons and the country, they would reject a measure the mere introduction of which, had the effect of silencing a clamour for Reform, at once alarming, unusual, and unsafe; or that they would, by such a rejection, hazard a renewal of the clamour, which had been, for a time so happily suspended. The noble Duke had indeed given them a little comfort in this respect, but he feared that even the most intelligent of the middle classes, availing themselves of the newspapers, and all the other sources of information at their command, would hardly be able to gather from the language of the noble Duke any thing more than a remote, uncertain, indistinct design not to propose or to adopt any measure, but perhaps, respectfully to consider some proposition of Reform, after a few trifling events—such as the going out of one Administration, and the coming in of another—had taken place. From that indistinct and almost intentionally clouded hope he did not think, therefore, they could expect much. But then the noble Baron had said that, if their Lordships rejected this Bill, they would have the advantage (he thought the noble Baron called it) of considering the plan of the noble Duke; but what advantage there could be in that, he (the Marquis of Lansdown) was at a loss to discover. He trusted that noble Lords would rely upon their own capacity to discuss, and amend, if necessary, this Bill in Committee, so that if they sent it back at all to the House of Commons, it would be after proving to them and the country that they had earnestly applied their best efforts to perfect it. The noble Duke was determined that the House should lose nothing by the rejection of the Bill, for he not only gave his opinion upon its principles, but went into all its clauses, and, looking to the maps which accompanied it, suddenly pitched upon a yellow line drawn round a town near which he resided, which yellow line included in the boundary of the town a lodge, in his possession; but it did so happen that the Commissioners, when they included this lodge, which was occupied by a labourer, who paid no rates, also included twenty houses which did pay rates, which did not belong to him; so that, if they intended to increase his electioneering interest, they certainly did it in the oddest manner ever heard of. He had thought it necessary to set the noble Duke right upon this important point of the yellow line, and he had no doubt, that he had given the noble Duke great satisfaction in having done so. He would conclude with imploring their Lordships by adopting this Bill, to exhibit to the country their determination to amend the Constitution in a manner that would restore the prosperity of the country.

On the noble Marquis resuming his seat, Lord Kenyon moved the adjournment of the debate.

Earl *Grey* said, that, if there were many noble Lords still anxious to address the House, he should not be disposed to oppose the motion of further adjournment. Otherwise it would, of course, be desirable to proceed. At all events, if an adjournment were assented to, it must be upon the understanding, that the debate should be brought to a close to-morrow.

The Duke of *Wellington* observed, that there were many Peers who had received his Majesty's commands to meet the Knights of the Bath at dinner to-morrow. It would be exceedingly inconvenient to those noble Peers, if they should be expected to attend in that House when they had, at the same time, a duty to discharge towards his Majesty. He hoped, therefore, the noble Earl would not object to the adjournment of the debate to Friday next.

Earl *Grey* thought that, after the representation made by the noble Duke, he could not do otherwise than yield to his request, that the debate should be adjourned to Friday. It must be, however, upon the distinct understanding, that the debate should be brought to a conclusion upon that night, and, also, that he should not be expected to postpone the day for going into Committee beyond the day upon which he should have proposed it, if they had come to a decision upon the second reading to-morrow night. If, therefore, the Bill passed the second reading on Friday, he should propose going into the Committee on the following Monday.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, as the noble Earl had so readily acquiesced in the proposition he had made, he was sorry to be obliged to object to the arrangement he suggested, but the noble Earl must recollect that he had, some time since, stated, that, in his opinion, the House ought to have a sufficient interval to enable them maturely to consider the provisions of the Bill before they went into Committee. It would be a great convenience if the noble Earl would consent to postpone the Committee until after the Easter holidays. He was quite sure the House could not be prepared to enter upon the consideration of this Bill in Committee upon so early a day as Monday, supposing the vote for the second reading to be given on Friday; and, if they did go into Committee on the Bill upon that day, he begged the noble Earl to recollect, that they could only sit one or two days before the period arrived upon which the usual recess commenced.

The Duke of *Buckingham* reminded the noble Earl that there was business already fixed for Monday, of importance enough to occupy the whole of that day.

Earl *Grey* was always disposed to give the best attention to the suggestions of the noble Duke (Wellington); but when he considered how long the Bill had been before their Lordships—how long it had been made known to the Members of both Houses, and that there was not a clause in it with which every noble Lord in the House was not fully acquainted, he really could not concur in the opinion of the noble Duke, that their Lordships would not on Monday be fully prepared to discuss its provisions in Committee. As a proof of this, if any proof were wanting, there was scarcely a noble Lord who had not, in addressing the House against the Bill, applied himself to all those details which should more properly have been considered in Committee rather than in the debate on the principle of the Bill. As it was, therefore, of the utmost importance that they should not trifle with the question, but, on the contrary, proceed, with all expedition, in considering the provisions of the Bill, he hoped, if he consented to postpone the debate till Friday, that the Committee would be taken on Monday. With respect to the business alluded to by the noble Duke (Buckingham), he thought it was not of so much importance that it could not be postponed without inconvenience, and without detriment to the public service.

The Earl of *Harrowby* agreed, also, with the noble Earl in the propriety of settling the question as soon as possible, for the purpose of tranquillizing the public mind; but, he apprehended, it would be most unusual to call on the House to go into Committee on a particular day on a Bill, the second reading of which was as yet uncertain. He thought, too, that, even supposing their Lordships were assured the second reading would be carried, they could not be expected to make up their minds with respect to the amendments they intended to propose in the very short time the noble Earl was disposed to allow them. The case was very different from that of a common Bill, the second reading of which was nearly a matter of certainty. The discussion would, probably, be determined, at a late hour, on Saturday morning, and they were on the Sunday to make up their minds what amendments they would propose on Monday. The first clause was one of the most important of the Bill, and, in his opinion, they should be prepared to take all the clauses, not on their separate merits, but in connexion with each other as a whole. There were other Bills, too, almost equally important; and he thought that haste in going into the Committee was the less necessary, because it was most desirable that they should have all the Reform measures before them at the time they were called on to agree to the provisions of the present Bill. He was decidedly of opinion that they could not consent to the third reading of this Bill without those other measures; and by postponing the Committee till after Easter, they gave the other House an opportunity of occupying itself with the remaining Bills, that, when they came to decide definitively on the present Bill, they might have the whole of the measure of Reform at once fully under their consideration. He did not mean to say, they should proceed *pari passu* with the other measures, but that they should be in possession of the whole of the details.

He put it to the noble Earl and the House, whether they should not best discharge their duty to Parliament and the country by requiring all the measures to be under their view before they came to a final decision on any one of them. For these reasons he supported the proposition for fixing the Committee after Easter.

Lord Teynham moved that their Lordships meet on Friday at one o'clock.

Earl *Grey* hoped the noble Baron would not persevere in that Motion, as it would be inconvenient to many of their Lordships, and there would be ample time to come to a satisfactory conclusion of the debate without meeting at so early an hour. With respect to the time of going into Committee he had mentioned Monday, because he thought it would be convenient to noble Lords to understand the wishes of the Government on that subject. The best time for considering the period of going into Committee was, undoubtedly, however, after the Bill had been read a second time; and he, therefore, should offer no further objection to the adjournment.

Debate adjourned till Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, April 11, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bill brought in. By Sir CHARLES BURRELL, for the better Employment of Labourers in Agricultural Parishes.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Sir JAMES GRAHAM, the Report, Estimate, and Plan of the proposed New Docks and River Wall at Woolwich Yard.

Petitions presented. By Lord CASTLEREAGH, from Magherally, County of Down, against the proposed System of Education in Ireland; and by Lord COLE, to the same effect from Rathkeale, in the County of Limerick:—By Mr. WYSE, from Mr. Darcy Mahon, one of the late Commissioners of Stamps in Ireland, for Compensation for the loss of his place:—By Lord EBRINGTON, from the Inhabitants of Stoke Damerel, for the Amendment of 43 Geo. 3rd, relating to Burial Grounds:—By Mr. HUNT, from Bury, and the Township of Pilkington, Lancashire, in favour of the Factories Regulation Bill.

DURHAM GAOL — PETITION.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from William Tynemouth, a Prisoner in Durham Gaol, complaining of Cruelty on the part of the Gaoler, and neglect by the Visiting Magistrates. The petitioner was a total stranger to him, but his petition was accompanied by an assurance, that he was able to substantiate on oath the allegations contained within it. He was afraid it was the practice of visiting Magistrates to authorize gaolers to punish such persons as he represented to them were refractory; that he understood was the case with the unfortunate person whose petition he held in his hand; and, as he had not been able to get relief from the Judges of Assize, to whom he had complained, he had no other means of obtaining redress but by applying to that House for protection. He (Mr. Hunt) well knew there was a disposition on the part of gaolers and visiting Magistrates to stretch the power allowed them to the utmost, to the great discomfort of the unhappy persons subject to their authority.

Mr. *Trevor* said, that the petitioner had been for many years in Durham gaol, and his conduct during that time was of a most annoying character, approaching to that of a maniac, so much so, that the visiting Magistrates would be happy if they could get him removed to any other prison, as the only means by which they could get rid of the annoyance. The governor of Durham gaol was universally respected by the gentlemen of the neighbourhood, and, on a late occasion, upwards of forty prisoners, discharged from his custody under the Insolvent Debtors' Act, presented to him an address of thanks for his kindness, attention, and humanity. He could only add, on the part of the gaoler, he was quite prepared to enter into any investigation into his conduct.

Sir *Hedworth Williamson* said, he must add his testimony to the general good conduct and character of the governor of Durham gaol; and, he was sure, if the hon. member for Preston would visit the prison, he would see there was no inhumanity practised, but that the establishment was conducted on the best principles. He had himself, as foreman of the Grand Jury, known that the petitioner had, on various occasions, brought forward charges against the governor, for which, on an investigation taking place, there did not appear the slightest ground.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he did not impeach the character of the gaoler on his own knowledge, he had merely repeated the allegations in the petition. He believed that the statements of the hon. Members might be correct, but there was a possibility of Magistrates and Grand Jurors being liable to imposition.

Petition laid on the Table.

POST-OFFICE—NEWSPAPERS.] Mr. Hunt presented a Petition from certain Newsvenders, complaining that their Privileges were infringed upon by the Post-office Clerks, and praying that the Illegal Traffic in Newspapers by the latter might be stopped.

Lord *William Lennox* felt the inconvenience of introducing any discussion upon the presentation of petitions; it was a system he highly deprecated in a general point of view. There were, however, instances in which he thought the House would agree with him that some remarks were necessary: those were, when the petitioners founded their grievances upon false grounds; or when the petition contained any unfounded attack upon the character of any individual. On these grounds he would trespass upon the House for a few moments, not only with a view of putting the House right as to the privilege enjoyed by the Clerks of the Roads, but also to defend his noble brother, the Postmaster General, from the unfounded attack contained in the petition. He did not accuse the hon. member for Preston of participating in the attack, he only blamed him for not having thoroughly investigated the question before he brought it forward. Now, as to the "illegal traffic." The privilege of forwarding newspapers was one enjoyed by the Clerks of the Roads from time immemorial. In the 4th Geo. 3rd, cap. 24, sec. 6, the privilege is granted in the following words:—'Forasmuch as 'it has been usual for the Clerks in the 'Offices of his Majesty's Principal Secre- 'taries of State, and also for certain 'Officers in the Office of his Majesty's 'Postmaster General, to frank printed 'Notes and Proceedings in Parliament, 'and printed Newspapers, to be sent by 'the Post, be it therefore enacted, by the 'authority aforesaid, that it shall and may 'be lawful for such Clerks and Officers as 'aforesaid, being thereunto licensed by his 'Majesty's Principal Secretary of State, 'or his Majesty's Postmaster General re- 'spectively, to continue to frank such 'printed Notes and Proceedings in Parlia- 'ment, and printed Newspapers, as they 'have heretofore been accustomed to frank 'the same.' At that period there was no free trade in newspapers, for none, except the above-mentioned and Members of Parliament, could frank newspapers. In the 9th Geo. 3rd, the Clerks in the Secretary of State's office were deprived of this privilege, and a sum of 1,500*l.* granted to them as a compensation, which was afterwards raised to 2,500*l.* The privilege of the Clerks in the Post-office (of which there are now about eighteen interested) was left undisturbed. So much for the illegality. He would now very briefly point out the advantage gained to the revenue, and to the public convenience. The salaries of the Clerks who enjoyed the privilege were very trivial, their advantages being taken into consideration; it was a saving of some thousands to the revenue. With regard to the public convenience, the advantages were great. The publishers of the evening papers were enabled to send their late editions through the Clerks of the Post-office after the box of the public had been closed. It was necessary to close the box for the newspapers at six o'clock; and even a few weeks ago the letters were delayed twenty minutes, owing to the mass of newspapers. The public can put newspapers in until half-past seven by the payment of one halfpenny on each. The Clerks have the privilege until near eight o'clock, when they are put in, ready sorted, and free of charge. It had been stated, that the Clerks of the Roads altered newspaper directions to advance their own sale; such could not be the case, even if they were disposed to act so dishonestly, for the newspapers were sorted in quite a different office. He was aware many mistakes happened with regard to newspapers, and he would point out the reason. In one week last month, nearly 200 newspapers were put into the General Post-office with wrong addresses—many from being put in wet with the covers torn off. The practice in the Post-office is to return all misdirected newspapers to the publishers, and to send all papers fitting them to the covers that are found in the newspaper-box. By such means mistakes happened. These mistakes, caused by the carelessness of the newsvenders, were vented upon the Post-office.

Mr. *Hume* was not before aware of the fact just named by the noble Lord, and such being the case, he hoped a measure would be introduced to take away a privilege which operated in violation of the interests of the public, and he was sure that the House would not hesitate to grant such compensation to the Clerks of the Roads as would be just. He, therefore, with pleasure, supported the prayer of the petition.

Petition laid on the Table.

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.] Mr. *Andrew Johnston* presented a Petition from the Ministers, Elders, and Inhabitants of Aberdeen, praying that the Annual Grant to

Maynooth College be discontinued. The petitioners expressed their sorrow to feel themselves compelled to approach that House on the subject of the grant recently made by it, for the purpose of educating individuals for the Roman Catholic Church. They considered the principle on which this support to the Roman faith was given as unconstitutional; and they called the attention of the House to those countries where that faith prevailed, in order to demonstrate the melancholy evils which flowed from its profession. They submitted, that the view they took, in their petition, must be received and acceded to by every man who examined the sacred Scriptures for himself; and that, indeed, no other could be received on any truly religious principle. They said, that such a grant, on the mere ground of expediency, could not be defended; and they did not see how it was possible for any evil to the State to arise from withholding it; and they concluded by imploring the House to discontinue the grant accordingly. He agreed with the prayer of the petition, for he was convinced the Government was violating the Protestant principle by encouraging the Roman Catholic priests to make extracts from the Bible for the education of Protestant children. He understood that the proportion of the money paid by Scotland for the purpose of educating the Catholic clergy already amounted to 50,000*l.*, and he, as a Presbyterian, felt that such a course ought no longer to be continued.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* supported the prayer of the petition, which, he could assure the House, emanated from an exemplary and intelligent body, whose sentiments were entitled to the most serious consideration. It was wholly unjust, in his opinion, that money should be allowed for the education of Catholic priests, when the Scriptural education in the Kildare-street Society's schools was suppressed.

Colonel *Torrens* was surprised at the obliquity of understanding which could induce hon. Members to support such preposterous petitions as that now brought before the House. It was asserted, that it was wrong for a Protestant country to appropriate money for the education of Catholic priests, but did it not strike hon. Members, who made that observation, that it was equally as wrong to make the Irish Catholics support the Protestant Church?

Mr. *Trevor* supported the petition. He thought there was nothing whatever in it which merited the term preposterous. If any thing could be called preposterous, it was the withdrawal of a grant from a Society that had done so much good by the promotion of Scriptural education in Ireland, whilst encouragement was to be held out, by a grant to this Catholic College, for the education of Roman Catholic priests.

Mr. *Hume* thought the grant to Maynooth a most politic measure, because it enabled the Roman Catholic priests to be educated, without going, as formerly, to foreign lands, and he thought to withdraw this grant would be at once unjust, illiberal, and impolitic. If the principles of the hon. Members who accused the Roman Catholics of intolerance were acted on, a truly practical state of intolerance would be the result. The Protestants of Ireland, living, he might say, in a Catholic country, received a large sum from the public, but in England the Catholics got not a farthing from the public. The Presbyterians in Scotland received much more than all the 6,000,000 of Catholics in Ireland. He knew the petitioners to be excellent men in private life, but their views of things were very limited.

Mr. *Lefroy* differed in his opinion of the law and policy of the hon. member for Middlesex. The grant to Maynooth College was founded in the worst policy, for the State ought not to support opposite and conflicting religious opinions. When a part of the Catholic Church thought fit to reform itelf, its livings and its property continued in the hands of its members: they only changed their religion; but that part of the Church lands which was connected with monasteries was granted by Parliament to the Crown, who transferred it to lay holders. If there were any Church robbers, the laity were the guilty parties. The Protestants had never despoiled the Catholics, therefore, he doubted the law of the hon. member for Middlesex.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, that the subject of complaint was, that the grant should be continued to Catholics and withheld from Protestants. The only ground on which the grant could be defended was, as a sort of national compact formed at the Union but other compacts of the same nature had been altered, and he saw no reason why this should be maintained inviolate. He fully agreed with the remark of the hon. Member who preceded him, that the property had never been taken by Protestants from Catholics, but was equally Church property before the Reformation.

Mr. *James Grattan* said, that it was distressing to hear such discussion every night—to hear Irish Members saying that the two religions were not compatible. Ministers would find it difficult to govern a country with such conduct on the part of Members. Were the hon. Gentlemen doing their duty when they had suffered the grant to Maynooth College to go on from 1795, without complaining. Now they came forward only because they were sore on another subject, which had no relation to this. The grant at first was very politic; it was given in order that the College students of divinity might study in Ireland, instead of going to France, where such violent principles then prevailed

Sir *Frederick Trench* said, in answer to the observation of the hon. Member (Mr. Grattan), that he was one who was always opposed to the grant to Maynooth College.

Mr. *Lambert* conceived the grant to Maynooth to rest upon this point—are the Catholics to be educated as Christians, or not at all? If the former was intended, then the grant was highly proper.

Mr. *Andrew Johnston*, in moving that the petition be printed said, that some of the petitioners were persons well known for their scientific acquirements, and he considered their opinion well worth attending to.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* begged the House to remember that the grant had not been sought by the Catholics: the Government of the time had thought proper to propose it to them. He would defy the Gentlemen who opposed it to give an instance in which the Catholic priests had not endeavoured to preserve the peace; he had met them politically and spiritually, and he always found their efforts devoted to the maintenance of quiet.

Petition to be printed.

THE ANATOMY BILL.] Mr. Warburton moved that the Bill for regulating schools of Anatomy be recommitted.

Mr. *Hunt* must again express himself hostile to the Bill altogether, and considered there was not one word in it which would afford protection to the public, for which purpose it was said to be intended that it should be passed.

The House resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that it was not his original intention to extend the Bill to Ireland, but to leave it to the Members for that country to bring forward any suggestion they thought proper. He had, however, been waited upon by two deputations from the College of Surgeons in Dublin, and another medical body, soliciting the extension of the provisions of the Act to that country; and he, therefore, should move an addition to the first clause, extending the operation of the Act to Ireland.

Mr. *Wason* said, the effect of this Bill would be to deprive surgeons of the benefits which they now derived from practising anatomy at their private residences; and he must also condemn that part of it which legalised the sale of dead bodies, which was not only unnecessary, but would also lead to very unbecoming practices.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, it was his intention to propose an amendment, to the effect that all licenses to be granted for the establishment of schools of anatomy should receive the signature of two resident Magistrates of the city or district, certifying that the applicants were proper persons to have such establishments, and that a duty of *20l.* be paid on receiving the first license for a-year, and that *5l.* per annum be paid on its renewal.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that he never objected to the expenditure of the public money when the interests of the poorer classes, as in the present instance, were at stake; and he, therefore, intimated his intention of proposing an amendment, that three inspectors be appointed for the city of Westminster and Southwark, and one for each county.

On the question, that the word "Ireland" be inserted in the first clause,

Mr. *Ruthven* said, that he should oppose the addition of the word to the clause, being perfectly convinced that the effect of introducing such a Bill into Ireland would be to tend to the demoralization of the people. It would encourage the parent to traffic with the body of his child, and the child with that of the parent. The church-yards were more unprotected in Ireland than in England, and he was sure, therefore, that the people would view the introduction of the Bill with horror.

Mr. *Robinson* objected to the introduction of a clause of such importance in Committee. It ought to have been inserted in the Bill before it had been read a second time. He disapproved of the Bill as it regarded England, and, therefore, should support the opposition made to extending it to Ireland, where its provisions would be still more pernicious.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he had been induced to introduce the clause at the request of the profession of Ireland, provided it did not interfere with the mode in which the College of Surgeons in Dublin was supplied, and the privileges of the Royal Infirmary were not meddled with.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that the objection formerly urged against the Bill by the Irish Members was, that it did not extend to Ireland. He could see nothing in the objection of the hon. Member for Worcester to prevent its application to Ireland. The object was two-fold—namely, to facilitate science and to prevent crime. Surely if it were a good Bill for one country, it must be equally good for another.

Mr. *Crampton* said, if the Bill did not extend to Ireland, a traffic in dead bodies would take place from Ireland to England and Scotland, which would produce appalling results. He understood that the College of Surgeons in Dublin had lately come to an opposite conclusion, and were now averse to the extension of the Bill to Ireland.

Mr. *Sheil* could see no reason why the Bill should be less suitable to Ireland than to England. He was not aware that the people of Ireland were opposed to it, for there had been no expression of public opinion on the subject. Unless its application was common to both countries, he quite agreed with his hon. friend (the Solicitor General for Ireland), that it would afford an encouragement to the traffic in human bodies between the two countries. The Bill was calculated to improve science and prevent crime.

Mr. *Robinson* denied, that this Bill would prevent crime, although it might advance science. He thought that the people of Ireland should have time for consideration; and, whether it were a proper measure for England or not, in point of principle he thought that the people of Ireland should not be bound by the measure. The people who would be affected by this Bill should be consulted; and, failing that, he should vote for the Amendment of the hon. member for Downpatrick.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* admitted, that the proposed objects of the Bill were to prevent crime and promote the furtherance of anatomical science; but, nevertheless, he did not think that this Bill would effect either of these two very important objects. He very much doubted the legal operation of this Act to deliver over dead bodies happening to be in the possession of strangers, whether surgeons or others; and he was quite satisfied that the poorer classes would feel a greater objection to the Bill than the higher. In legislating upon this subject the wishes and the interests of the poorer classes should be considered; and after all, as he had just said, the clause relative to the legal custody of dead persons would not, in his opinion, confer a right to deliver over the body or bodies of dead persons to the surgeons for dissection. Suppose a man to die under a shed, or under a parcel of straw, over which other persons had an ownership, would it, he asked, be right that such owner or owners should have the legal right of disposal of such bodies? To such a clause he would object, and particularly on the ground that the period of human life might be abridged in some instances for the sake of the body, which Bill as it now stood enabled the person possessing the body to dispose of it.

Mr. *Warburton* observed, that it was not fair to raise objections on account of circumstances which might by possibility occur in the operation of the Bill. They ought to look at the present state of the law, and see what remedy could be supplied to remove all, or the greater portion, of the evil. His object was not merely to promote the ends of science, but to bring that science to the poor man's door, that the practitioner who attended the poorest man might be equally qualified with the practitioner who attended the rich. It was objected that many of the persons who were in the hospitals, whose bodies by this Bill were to be given up for dissection, might have their deaths accelerated for the purpose of having their bodies to dispose of. He conceived that he had provided against this by the necessity of officers being first required to examine the body. But was not such a practice pursued now, without any means whatever to prevent or check it? The only way to prevent those monstrous practices which were known to have prevailed was, to reduce the price for subjects for dissection. He thought, when the Bill came into operation, the facilities for committing these horrible crimes would be a hundred degrees less than at present.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* considered that, when the clause proposed by the hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Inglis) was added, the Bill would prove of great utility.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, in order that such a measure as this should have a fair trial, he would first propose that the Bill should be in force for a year and a day. He would propose further, that the obligation which the parish were at present under, to be at the expense of burying a pauper, should be transferred to the officers appointed under this Act.

Mr. *Hunt* observed, that it would be better to try the Bill as an experiment in England. If it worked well, then extend it to Ireland. The hon. member for Bridport had wished an impossibility if he desired to extend the benefit of science to the poor, for, if a bungler existed, that bungler would gain the attendance on the poor. He was of opinion that the sale of dead bodies when legalized would not prevent crime. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had legalized the sale of game with the view of preventing poaching; but had it effected the desired object? The same want of success would attend this Anatomy Bill.

Mr. *Weyland* thought it would be better to leave matters in this respect as they were, rather than adopt the Bill before them. He was persuaded that this measure would assist the work of the resurrection-men and others. It was impossible to say that the sale of the bodies of the poor would not lead to the worst effects. The inspectors ought to have power to adopt proceedings in case they should discover anything wrong. A poor man, who thought that the body of his deceased relative had been improperly made away with, had no remedy but an expensive prosecution, which it was known he could not afford.

Mr. *Shaw* thought that the Bill ought to be extended to Ireland, and that the laws ought always to be assimilated, as much as possible, between the two countries: if it were not so extended, there would be connivances to evade the Bill.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* felt it his duty to oppose the extension of this Bill to Ireland.

The Committee divided on the Amendment extending the Bill to Ireland: Ayes 43; Noes 3—Majority 40.

Sir *Robert Inglis* moved an Amendment on the clause giving the power of licence and inspection of anatomical schools to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to the effect that all such licences should be granted only to licentiates and graduates in surgery and medicine, and other persons legally qualified to practise in medicine and surgery.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that the proposed verbal Amendment of the hon. Member would prevent private schools of anatomy being kept by private surgeons, from whose skill and science great advantages were derived to the students of anatomy and surgery. Having this opinion, he must oppose the Amendment. He wished to give every facility to the students in anatomy, and, if this Amendment were agreed to, the most unnecessary restrictions would be imposed upon that branch of their studies. He thought that every security would be afforded by this Bill for the protection of the public, because no person would be permitted to open a school without the consent of a regular professor, supported by the sanction of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. On the Continent the study of anatomy occupied five or six years—in this country only a year and a half, or two years; and it would be very injurious to prevent the student from having every advantage which he could derive from that source, during his limited period of study.

Sir *Robert Inglis* was induced to move this Amendment, because he thought some security should be afforded to the public against a repetition of those crimes which had disgraced this country. It was not many years since a medical practitioner himself had been suspected of a participation in those crimes, but the power of inspection would, he hoped, prevent any suspicion attaching itself to any member of the medical profession.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he would rather give up the Bill entirely than consent to the Amendment; for, without private dissection, no progress in anatomical science could be made.

Lord *Althorp* disapproved of the Amendment, and concurred with the hon. member for Bridport in thinking it was calculated to impede the progress of medical science.

Mr. *Wason* said, the Amendment tended to afford protection to the public, and he thought it would not in any degree prevent private dissection, and, consequently, could not interfere with the interest of science.

Lord *William Lennox* said, if the only object of the Bill was to benefit the practitioner, then he would not make the objection he did to students being allowed to have part of the subjects to dissect at their own house. But the public feeling ought to be consulted. A whole body might be recognized, but, if parts were mangled, would it not be an encouragement to individuals to murder and cut them up before sale to prevent discovery?

Mr. *John Campbell* considered it to be a reproach to the law of England, that Judges should have decided that the possession of portions of the human body for the purposes of science should be considered so heinous an offence as it had hitherto been.

Mr. *Warburton* would consent to the Amendment proposed, on the condition of adding a provision by which students should not be excluded from the benefits of private dissection, and also that a certificate would be required from two Magistrates before any licence should be granted.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that, notwithstanding what had been then said, he would divide the Committee on the Amendment of the hon. member for Oxford.

The Committee divided on the Amendment: Ayes 6; Noes 50—Majority 44.

Mr. *Wason* moved an Amendment on the same clause, to the effect that no entire human body should be taken to any private house for the purpose of dissection.

Mr. *Warburton* opposed the Amendment, as it would prevent the country practitioner from renewing his acquaintance with his profession from time to time, as was indispensable, or compel him to come up to London, or elsewhere, in order to avail himself of the practice of the schools of anatomy.

Mr. *John Campbell* considered the Amendment was perfectly unnecessary, for no person would have an entire body when he only wanted a part. He thought it would materially injure the Bill.

Colonel *Sibthorp* requested that the further consideration of the Bill might be postponed till there was a more full attendance of Members. He was astonished at the language used by the hon. member for Stafford upon this occasion. The Amendment gave encouragement to the wholesale cutting up of the bodies of the poor, joint by joint.

Mr. *Hume* did not understand the commiseration expressed for the poor by hon. Members, who would, at the same time, prevent surgeons acquiring that knowledge, the want of which was most felt by that class of persons. He hoped the hon. member for Ipswich would not persevere in his Amendment.

Mr. *Hunt* would not be deterred by any observations from moving his Amendments to this disgusting Bill. He had an Amendment on every clause. He detested the whole measure. He wished those rich Gentlemen, who talked about the poor, would give up their bodies. He would move, that every Gentleman who voted for the Bill, as well as all sinecurists, should be given up for dissection.

Mr. *Philip Howard* said, that the Bill had the sanction of a Prince of the Blood, who had promised to give up his body for the benefit of science; and if he (Mr. Howard) could be of any use after his death, he should be happy to do the same. He supported the clause as it stood, and reminded the member for Preston that it was the poor, and not the rich, who suffered from the defective state of anatomical knowledge, which was most sensibly felt in the country and in small towns, where professional men, notwithstanding their eagerness to obtain such knowledge, were debarred from doing so by the state of the law.

Mr. *Hunt*, in reference to the last remark of the hon. member for Carlisle, said, that he always understood the bodies of the Royal Family were embalmed, and, therefore, the royal Duke had really done nothing.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that, if he were asked to give an opinion, he would say, that, although we had in the metropolis some of the ablest anatomists in the world, there were many country practitioners exceedingly deficient in their knowledge of anatomy.

Amendment negatived.

Sir *Robert Inglis* moved a clause imposing a fee of 20*l*., a stamp on the licences of 5*l*., and an annual tax of 1*l*. on the admission of persons to practise anatomy in the schools, which would raise a fund for defraying the expense of carrying the Act into execution.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he must oppose the Amendment. He had numerous representations against the proposition in a former Bill, of paying 2*l*. on each licence. It would defeat the object of the measure.

Mr. *Robinson* said, the effect of this Amendment would be, to press unfairly upon the junior members of the profession.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. *Hunt* proposed, as an Amendment, that there should be an Inspector for the city of London, one for the city of Westminster, another for the borough of Southwark, and one for each county in England and Wales.

Mr. *Warburton* thought it was better to wait till they saw how the Bill worked. He was informed that one Inspector, with the assistance of some policemen, would be sufficient. The Bill left it discretionary with the Secretary of State to appoint more if it should be deemed necessary.

Sir *Charles Burrell* said, every precaution ought to be taken to ensure an efficient superintendence; and one Inspector did not appear to him sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. *Briscoe* thought the salary of 100*l*. for an Inspector quite inadequate. The duty would require constant attention, and no person, calculated for the situation, would accept it with so small a remuneration.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. *Hume* suggested that some regulation should be entered into for rendering the duty of searchers in parishes more effective.

Mr. *Lamb* said, there had been a measure under consideration to regulate the duties of those searchers, but he was not then prepared to state what progress had been made in it.

Mr. *Hunt* then moved, that one Inspector be elected in every county, in the way that Coroners are elected.

Mr. *Warburton* thought it would be better, as proposed by the Bill, to leave that matter to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who could appoint such numbers of Inspectors as might be found necessary.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he should take the sense of the Committee on his Amendment.

The Committee divided on the Amendment: Ayes 10; Noes 52—Majority 42.

An Amendment, proposed by Mr. Hunt, "that the Inspectors should make monthly returns of subjects dissected to the Secretary of State," was agreed to.

Mr. *Weyland* wished to propose, as an Amendment, that the Inspectors should be allowed at any time to visit any private house where he heard that anatomy was practised.

Mr. *Warburton* observed it was impossible any such Amendment could be agreed to: it would give the Inspector power to enter any man's house, whenever he might desire to do so. Such an Amendment would interfere with the liberty of the subject.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. *Hunt* had then to move, that the salary to the Inspector should be paid out of the county-rates, and be allowed by the Magistrates in the usual way. He thought 100*l*. a-year for each Inspector was not enough. They would take that sum, and, in the neighbourhood of an anatomical school, make 1,000*l*. of it.

Mr. *Warburton* did not consider the salary too small; indeed, he had received several letters from some highly respectable gentlemen expressive of their readiness to accept that salary. He thought, also, it was but fair that, as the Secretary of State had the appointments, the salaries were properly chargeable on the Consolidated Fund.

Amendment withdrawn, and clause agreed to.

On the next clause, which empowers any person having the legal custody of a dead body to dispose of it for dissection, if it be not proved that the deceased had objected to such a disposal of his or her body, being moved,

Sir *Robert Inglis* proposed to add a clause, making it a misdemeanour, punishable with a fine of 500*l*., if any person not duly licensed should practise dissection; and, also, a misdemeanour for any governor of a hospital, or gaoler, to sell or dispose of subjects. It was his object to supply bodies from parishes, and he would also propose, that all persons found dead, and unclaimed for the space of three days should be given up to the parish authorities; and, after an inquest duly held, might be disposed of by them for the purposes of dissection. He should not now move, but reserve the Amendments to a later stage of the Bill.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he had also an Amendment to move to the effect that no body should be disposed of for dissection, unless the consent of the deceased, in writing, duly authenticated by two respectable witnesses, should be produced.

Mr. *Robinson* thought there was something most unseemly and revolting in the Commons' House of Parliament legislating on such a clause, by which the sale of the dead, of the wife by the husband, of the son by the father, and relatives trafficking in the remains of relatives, was legalized. He never would be a consenting party to a proposition so monstrous. He knew the public were opposed to this clause, and he would not consent to such an outrage on public feeling. There was already a prejudice amongst the poor, that the rich had no sympathy in their sufferings, and this clause would tend materially to increase that prejudice. If the clause passed the Committee, which he sincerely hoped it would not, an addition ought to be inserted, making it imperative that proof should be first given that the deceased party had himself consented, before death, that his remains should be given for dissection.

Mr. *Warburton* could not consent to this proposition. It was already provided by the Bill, that the consent of the nearest relations must be first had and obtained before the subject could be disposed of for dissection, and what more could the hon. Gentleman wish for? With respect to the observations of the hon. member for Oxford to prevent, the sale of bodies in the way he mentioned, he should say, it would be impossible to watch or to discover such a transaction, and he never would be a party to such hypocritical legislation.

Mr. *Wason* said, when he first read this Bill, he thought, and such was still his opinion, that it was, from beginning to end, a perfect specimen of hypocritical legislation; for it proposed one thing to the House, and another to the people. He should, with much pleasure, support the proposition of the hon. member for Oxford, and confine the supply to the workhouses.

Mr. *Fane* said, he must deprecate the apparent indifference of some Members in that House to the dissection and indecent exposure of their nearest and dearest relations.

Mr. *Briscoe* thought this so important a clause, that he should move that the Chairman should report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Wason seconded the Motion.

Mr. *Hume* put it to the hon. Mover, if it was fair, or at all the practice of the House, to make such a motion, when the clause had been discussed.

Mr. *Robinson* denied that the clause had been discussed, at least not sufficiently.

Mr. *Dawson* was entirely opposed to the Bill, which was calculated to expose the poor, and to protect the rich. He thought, also, it was high time that the Chairman should report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir *John Sebright* denied the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and considered the Bill was eminently calculated to protect the poor; and it was on that account the Bill had his support.

Mr. *Warburton* could not but remind the House of the enormities practised; and he would then ask, if the time was not now come when they should endeavour, at least, to prevent them?

Mr. *Dawson* still thought that the Bill was calculated rather to increase than to diminish the crime called burking.

Sir *Robert Peel* thought the clause now before the House involved the whole principle of the Bill. He begged to ask the House, what had been the consequence of the sanction of the law for the sale of subjects having been so long withheld. It was manifest and notorious that sales took place, and the supply was kept up by continued robberies, committed by persons of the most desperate and degraded characters. To add to the supply, it had been clearly proved, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that systematic murders had been perpetrated, and though, in Scotland and in this metropolis, only three criminals had suffered the extreme penalty of the law, it was impossible to say how many murders had been committed for the sake of disposing of the bodies. He was informed, some years ago, by two highly respectable medical practitioners, that, when they paid twelve guineas for a subject, they did so with remorse, feeling that so large a sum was but an incentive to the commission of the most atrocious crime. Now, as the penalties for dissecting were annihilated, the only means of remedying the dreadful evils at present existing was, by legalizing the supply. The Bill afforded all classes an opportunity of protesting against their bodies being subjected to anatomical examination, by leaving a writing to that effect. He dissented entirely from the proposition of the hon. member for Oxford, that the supply should be made, not from the hospitals, not from the gaols, but from the poor-houses. He contended it was not fair to cast such an odium on the poor, and to subject them to a law from the provisions of which the rich were relieved, and he thought the law should be made to operate generally on all classes. This, he considered, was effected by the clause at present before the House, and he should, therefore, support it.

Mr. *Hunt* had heard the speech of the right hon. Baronet with surprise. The Bill threw the supply entirely on the poor. How could the poor man in gaol make a protest to save himself from dissection? A poor wretch dying in gaol could never hope to receive the least advantage from a protest. No one would be ready to prove such a protest. It might be called in that House a Bill for the benefit of the poor, but it would not be so called out of that House. It was a Bill calculated to brutalize the human race. He had hopes that the Bill would never pass in another House.

Lord *Althorp* said, the argument of the member for Preston went to prove there ought to be no anatomical examination at all. What was the case at present? Was there any way of preventing dissection; and was it not better to insure a supply without so many horrible excesses as they knew were committed? The object was to take away the temptation to commit breaches of the law. The Bill would put rich and poor on the same footing.

Mr. *Courtenay* contended that it was virtually admitted, that the clause in question allowed the sale of the bodies of the poor to the highest bidder, and, therefore, it should be submitted to a more serious debate.

The *Attorney-General* said, it was manifest the object of the clause was to put an end to the dreadful system which had been clearly proved in the Courts of Justice of the country, and, therefore, it ought to be passed without undue delay. The tone assumed by hon. Gentlemen opposite had, through the evening debate, been addressed to the jealous passions of the most uneducated, or least informed, in the community, and was calculated to render Members of this House loth to offer any suggestions in support of this measure, lest they should subject themselves to that degree of opprobrium which had been so lavishly heaped on the hon. member for Bridport, whose laudable exertions entitled him to the best thanks of the country.

Mr. *Dawson* entertained a totally different opinion. He could not see the clause in the same point of view in which it had been put by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. It was a Bill in support of science against humane feeling.

Mr. *Briscoe* must press his Motion to a division. The Committee divided on the Motion to report progress: Ayes 11; Noes 59—Majority 48.

Mr. *Dawson* repeated his objections to the Bill, and insisted on the propriety of an adjournment of the debate. It was impossible that the clause could pass that night, and he was astonished at the pertinacity with which the hon. Members opposite opposed Gentlemen sitting on his (Mr. Dawson's) side of the House.

Mr. *Warburton* was well aware of the heavy duties of hon. Gentlemen holding office, and was perfectly willing to place himself in the hands of the noble Lord and those having official duties to discharge.

The *Attorney-General* said, he should remain to the last moment to support a Bill which was so advantageous to the public. They had gained, in the course of the debate, an admirable speech from the right hon. member for Tamworth, whose opinion might have silenced all opposition to the measure.

Lord *Althorp* thought the clause then in dispute had been discussed, and the House was at liberty to come to a decision on it; he, therefore, recommended his hon. friend to persevere.

Mr. *Briscoe* expressed a hope that the adjournment would not be opposed.

The *Attorney General* did not support the measure in his official character, but on the conviction that the measure was essential, and he would remain to the last to support it.

Lord *Althorp* recommended his hon. friend, the member for Bridport, to persevere with the clause before the House, which had already been so fully discussed.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that, valuing as he did the time of his noble and right hon. friends near him, he should not, at that late hour, further oppose the adjournment of the debate.

Lord *Ebrington* complained of the hon. member for Bridport yielding to the Gentlemen who had opposed the measure. He wished the proposition of the Attorney-General should be adopted. For himself, he would sit here till to-morrow morning to support the measure.

Mr. *Warburton* could not, under the circumstances to which he had already alluded, refuse the adjournment.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that the doors of the gallery were closed for the last three-quarters of an hour, and the reporters had been excluded, When he mentioned this just now, the Attorney General had unequivocally denied that the gallery was closed, but that the reporters had got tired of the debate and gone away. Now, what was the fact? The moment the doors were opened, the reporters were again at their posts.

The House resumed; the Committee to sit again.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, April 13, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Earl of RADNOR, from Chard, against Tithes:—By the Earl of DARTMOUTH from Olney, for a Revision of the Poor Laws:—By the

Duke of **Wellington**, from Protestant Inhabitants of Galway, against the Indemnity Bill; and from John Percy Holloway, of Rye, and by the Earl of **Harewood**, from Bridlington, against the Reform Bill:—By Lord **Lorton**, from Killesher and Screen:—By the Earl of **Wicklow**, from Bulmer-cum-Belchamp, Walter, and Middleton, and from the Tithe-payers of Tully and Aughrrish for a Provision to make the Tithe Composition Act compulsory:—By the Earl of **Roden**, from Temple Trim; and By the Bishop of **Gloucester**, from the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester, against the New System of Education in Ireland:—By Earl **Grey**, from the Inhabitants of Cork for the Restoration of the Ancient Rights of the Citizens of that place, and that the Officers of the Corporation may be chosen by the Rate-payers; and from the Renfrewshire Agricultural Society in favour of Reform:—By a **Noble Lord**, from the Inhabitants of Clogher, for the Abolition of Tithes in Ireland:—By the Earl of **Camperdown**, from the Inhabitants of Lockwinnock, Culfreightrin, and Grange, in favour of the Reform Bill; and by Lord **Teynham**, from the Inhabitants of Horsham, for a Limitation of the Hours of Working in Factories.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—PETITION.] Lord *Holland* presented a Petition in favour of the new Ministerial System of Education in Ireland, agreed upon unanimously by the clergy of those bodies of Protestant Dissenters in and within twelve miles of the metropolis, known under the designation of the Three Denominations—Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents. The prayer of the petition was, that their Lordships would give their assent and support to the system of National Education in Ireland proposed by his Majesty's Ministers. He did not mean, by anything he might say in presenting the petition to provoke a discussion on the subject of the new system of Education in Ireland. He should be sorry to create any discussion that was likely to interfere with that most important question which was at present pending in their Lordships' House; but it was his bounden duty on presenting the petition to describe who and what the petitioners were. They were not a corporate body, and therefore he did not propose that the petitions should be received as that of a corporate body. He was aware that it could be received only as the petition of those who signed it. But, in point of fact, they did form a most important, opulent, and influential portion of the great mass of the community, and had always been recognised as a most important body under the name of Protestant Dissenters, ever since the accession of the House of Hanover. These petitioners represented 36,000 of the most opulent and influential of that most respectable body—a body to which for its vigorous support of the principles of civil and religious liberty, and the right of private judgment, the country owed such a heavy debt of gratitude, and to which he certainly felt most grateful. He did not, however, mean to take up the time of their Lordships by pronouncing any lengthened eulogium on this body. But he knew, notwithstanding the serious differences on the points of faith between themselves, they had, after much deliberation and consideration, unanimously agreed to petition their Lordships in support of the system of national education in Ireland proposed by his Majesty's Ministers. They were called The Three Denominations because, at the passing of the Toleration Act, they were divided into the three separate bodies of Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents, for the purpose of more convenient correspondence with Government. They were all decided supporters of the right of private judgment, and the free use and circulation of the Scriptures; and having, after mature deliberation, agreed on this petition, he hoped that it would be the means of allaying the apprehensions, and dissipating much of the idle delusion which prevailed on this subject, both in this House and elsewhere. He moved that the petition, which was a very short one, be read.

Read accordingly.

The Earl of *Roden* said, the noble Baron seemed to consider that a delusion existed in the minds of these other petitioners who had prayed their Lordships not to sanction the proposed system of education in Ireland. If such was the case, all he could say was, it was a delusion shared by the great mass of Protestants in Great Britain and in Ireland. He did not mean to cast any imputation on the noble Lord; but he was not surprised that he had been selected to present the petition, as he observed that several of those who signed it were Socinians. Neither was he surprised that they at least were agreed upon the propriety of adopting a system which went to exclude the use of the whole Bible from the people.

Lord *Holland:* It was signed certainly by his most respected friend, Mr. William Smith, and many most respectable persons of the same persuasion. But he might venture to say, that less than one-third of the petitioners were Unitarians. As to the writings of Socinus, perhaps the noble Lord opposite had read more of them than he had done. A great body of the petitioners held the doctrine of the Trinity, and the other high Calvinistic doctrines;

and he believed that even the right reverend Prelates would not wish to exclude from the hands of the student of divinity the works of Doctor Lardner. But whatever they might be, whether Trinitarians or Unitarians, they had a right to petition their Lordships on this subject; and however differing among themselves, they had unanimously agreed upon this petition.

The Earl of *Wicklow* said, the noble Baron, while disclaiming discussion, had contrived to make two speeches on the subject of education in Ireland. This was, however, he believed, the first petition which had come from any part of the country in favour of the new plan adopted by Ministers. He would in a few days make a motion for a return of the number of petitions which had been presented on this subject, in order that it might be seen what was the opinion of the public upon it. Noble Lords opposite called upon the House to agree to the Bill for Reform, on the ground that the opinion of the country had been pronounced in its favour. He might with greater reason, on the same ground, call on their Lordships to reject the newly-adopted plan of education in Ireland.

The Bishop of *Bristol* did not object to the receiving of the petition, but he was apprehensive that this new system of education would go to supersede the use of the Scriptures in the schools, and thereby prevent a fair competition between the Protestant and Catholic. He must also protest against an opinion which seemed to prevail, that the Civil Magistrate had no right to interfere in order to protect the progress of the truth. An obligation to do that had long been felt and acted upon by the Legislature of this country in its endeavours to promote the interest of Protestantism. He had no wish to intimate that his Majesty's Ministers entertained any views hostile to that object, but he was apprehensive that the measure in contemplation might obstruct and tend to supersede the general use of, and reference to the entire volume of the Scriptures, by the free use of which alone religious errors could be removed, and without which no just system even of moral education could be grounded.

Earl *Grey* said, it certainly was not his intention to enter at the present moment, into a defence of his Majesty's Government, or to promote a discussion with respect to the conduct pursued by them in reference to the new system of national education for Ireland, the more particularly when he recollected the importance of the question which awaited the decision of their Lordships that evening. All, therefore, that he would state, upon the present occasion was, that Ministers were most certainly not opposed to the free circulation of the Scriptures; on the contrary, they were as anxious and as sincerely affected wards Protestantism as any of his Majesty's subjects, not even excepting the right reverend Prelates themselves; and so far from wishing to exclude the Bible, there was an express regulation made, whereby the free use of the Bible was provided for; the general system, however, being so constructed, as not to defeat the great object of giving national education to the people at large. He would not trouble their Lordships by going further into this subject at the present moment; but at the proper time, he should be prepared to maintain the propriety of the grounds on which his Majesty's Government had acted.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, the noble Earl had stated that it was not his wish to promote discussion on this subject; but nothing was so likely to produce that effect as the course which the noble Earl had taken. He did not question the motives or objects of Ministers, but he differed *in toto*, from them with respect to the proposed system; at the same time he perfectly agreed with the noble Earl that nothing would be more inconvenient than to enter into a discussion on this subject at the present moment; and on that ground alone it was, that he would not reply to the observations of the noble Earl.

Earl *Grey* had only stated the object of Ministers, and, at the same time, claimed credit on their part for entertaining a sincere desire to promote the Protestant interests, and to provide religious education. He had, moreover, distinctly reserved his opinion as to the means to be taken to carry those objects into effect to a more convenient time. Nothing, he thought, could be less likely to create a discussion than the course he had taken.

Petition to lie on the Table.

Earl *Grey* said, that he had now to present a petition from a body of Dissenting ministers in London. These were men who held all the doctrines of the Church of England, and who, but for some slight circumstances, would not object to sign the Thirty-nine Articles. They could not be accused of any wish to restrain the circulation of the Scriptures, and yet they approved of the plan of education recently adopted in Ireland. The petition had been placed in his hands by Drs. Bentley and Fletcher, who represented a body actuated by the purest spirit of Christian charity. He would beg leave to move that the petition be read, as he thought nothing could be more creditable to the moral and religious feelings of those who signed it.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that the petitioners seemed to imagine that if Parliament did not make this grant, there would be no education in Ireland; but that would be a great mistake, as probably two-thirds of the schools in connexion with the Kildare-street Society, would be kept up and supported by the exertions of private individuals. What was complained of with respect to the new plan of education in Ireland was this—that its practical effect would be greatly injurious to the education of Protestants. From the statement made by a right hon. Gentleman in another place, it seemed that one charge against the Kildare-street Society was, that they did not make that fair distribution of the funds committed to their management which would give equal advantages to the children of Catholics as well as Protestants. Now, it appeared that in the schools there were an equal number of Catholic and Protestant children, though the number of the former in the country was five to one greater than the latter. If the object was, to have the number of Catholic children in the schools in a greater degree proportioned to their numbers in the country, the effect of the new regulation would be to displace 41,000 Protestant children, and to put so many Catholics in their room.

Earl *Grey* said, the object was, not to displace the Protestant children, but so to model the whole system, as that a greater number of Catholic children might avail themselves of the advantages which those schools gave.

Petition to lie on the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM — BILL FOR ENGLAND — SECOND READING — FOURTH DAY.] The Order of the Day for the second reading of the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill read.

Lord Wynford rose to address their Lordships but,

Lord *Kenyon* moved that his Lordship be permitted to address the House sitting, in consequence of his infirmity of body.

Agreed to.

Lord *Wynford*, after thanking their Lordships for this mark of considerate indulgence, proceeded: The course which he intended to pursue in the discussion would not, he said, be so entertaining as many of the speeches which had been delivered by the noble Lords who had spoken before him; for he meant to take a near view of the principles of the Bill, if, on minute examination of its details, he could make out what those principles were. Though he might have occasion to trespass for some time upon their attention, he trusted that he should not be considered as trespassing improperly upon it; for, if he did not deceive himself, he thought that he should be able to demonstrate, to the conviction of their Lordships that this was the worst of the three bad Bills which had been presented to them for the purpose of accomplishing a Reform in Parliament. Before he applied himself to a consideration of the principles, such as they were, of the Bill, it was necessary that he should notice some of the remarks which had fallen from the noble Lords in this discussion, particularly as one noble Earl had distinctly alluded to him, and made a charge against him, than which nothing could be more unfounded. The noble Earl had said, that he was proceeding on unfounded suspicions, and that upon those unfounded suspicions he was making grave charges against his Majesty's Ministers. The noble Earl had conceived it expedient to suppose that he (Lord Wynford) had been so long engaged in courts of law as to have contracted a suspiciousness of temper. Now he had no hesitation in telling the noble Earl that he looked back with no less pride than pleasure to the time which he had passed in the courts of law; for he knew that if he had not acted an honest and able part within them, he should not have had the honour of enjoying a seat among their Lordships. He had been told that the noble Earl passed much of his time in courts of justice. He meant to say nothing offensive to the noble Earl; but this he must say, that in his opinion, the country was more benefitted by the noble Earl's presence in courts of justice than it was by his presence in Parliament. He was afraid that the noble Earl had himself contracted a suspicious turn of mind from his presence at judicial investigations, for otherwise the noble Earl would never have suspected him of making indirect imputations against his Majesty's Ministers. He appealed to all who heard the speech which he had made on presenting the petition from Arundel, whether he had thrown out any imputations against his Majesty's Government. He never would say anything till he had proof, and, when he had proof, he would not deal in mere imputation. The petition which he had presented from Arundel made certain allegations. Some of them he knew from his own knowledge to be true; but the most important allegations among them might be true or might be false, for anything he knew, and that he had stated to their Lordships. He had said, however, that if those allegations were allegations of fact, the Members of his Majesty's Government had been influenced by a zeal which had grossly misled them. He had likewise asserted—and he now repeated the assertion—that, though the storm had blown down the boroughs which were in the hands of the Tories, it had, by some singular fatality, always spared those which were in the hands of the Whigs. He would prove that to be the fact. Yes, before he sat down, he would prove, to the satisfaction of all who heard him, that the Bill left untouched many nomination boroughs which were in the hands of the Whigs—nay more, he would prove that it seemed to have about it (if he might borrow a phrase which had lately been much commented on in another place) "fructifying qualities," under which new nomination boroughs would grow up and flourish. He lamented that three noble Lords, for whom he entertained a very sincere respect, had not given his side of the House the advantage of their great talents on this occasion; but he could not say, that their exertions in favour of the Bill had done much harm to their former friends, for those noble Lords had unfortunately placed themselves in a situation in which no talent of theirs could do any mischief. They had stated the grounds upon which they had changed—not their opinions, for their opinions they declared to be still the same, but—their votes upon this Bill. One of those noble Lords had stated, that he considered this Bill a worse Bill than the last, and yet, though he had rejected the last Bill, that noble Lord came down to the House ready to give his vote in support of the present. The noble Earl who had spoken first of these three noble Lords had said, that the last Bill was founded on population entirely, and that the present Bill was founded on property entirely. Now, he had looked through the Bill with the utmost attention, and he could not for his life discover any principle of property in it—on the contrary, it annihilated in effect the right of voting in those who had property, by bestowing it in greater numbers upon those who had none. There was one clause, to which it was true the noble Earl had objected, much worse in this than in the previous Bill; he alluded to the 10*l.* clause, which the noble Earl at the head of the Administration had told their Lordships he considered as a material principle of the Bill, which he could not consent on any account to abandon, as he thought that it gave its whole value to the Bill. The noble Earl had objected to the 10*l.* clause in the last Bill; and yet the 10*l.* clause in this Bill went much further. Under the old Bill the householders must be rated at 10*l.*: now they need not be rated at a single shilling.

Earl *Grey* regretted to be obliged to interrupt the noble Lord for a moment, but, he certainly had mistaken the effect of the clauses. It was not necessary by the late Bill, that a person to possess a vote must be rated for a house of the value of 10*l.*, there were four ways in which a man holding a 10*l.* house might be qualified. He might have a vote by being rated to that amount—by paying rent to the amount—by paying taxes to the amount—or, by proving his House to be of the value required.

Lord *Wynford* said, that in the former Bill the 10*l.* householder must be rated at 10*l.* per year, though if he were not rated, and the value were proved to be more than 10*l.* a-year, he could claim to be instantly put upon the rates. But under the present Bill he need not be rated at all.

Earl Grey again dissented.

Lord *Wynford* said, that though he had not the clause then by him, he was quite certain that he was right in the interpretation which he had put on it. Indeed he should have no objection to rest the fate of the Bill itself on the issue of his correctness as to that clause. But be that as it might, still there was in this Bill a striking difference from the three Bills on the same subject which were its immediate predecessors, and from every other Bill which was to be found in the statute book. In every statute, from the reign of Henry 6th, down to that of William 4th. a precise and real value must be attached to the property giving a vote, but, under this Bill any plea might be adopted, any imaginary standard might be taken with respect to a House, and, if it satisfied the conscience of the holder, it would serve to give him a vote. Forty shillings might be converted into 40*l.* [Earl *Grey* : "*No.*"] The noble Earl need not interrupt him, as he would hereafter have an opportunity of replying to his statements; and if the noble Earl could show either that his facts or that the conclusions which he drew from them were wrong, he (Lord Wynford) would say that he was unable to deal with this subject. Some noble Peers who were prepared to vote for the second reading, in the hope of amending in the Committee defects in the Bill which they admitted to be so monstrous as to require the rejection of the Bill on the motion for the third reading, if they could not be amended in the Committee, were acting a very foolish and dangerous part. He wished, if possible, to undeceive their Lordships. This Bill could not be amended in Committee, and this was the last night on which their Lordships could give an efficient vote against it. He knew that with the assistance of those noble Lords, and those Members of the right rev. Bench who were acting with them, they (the Opposition) might perhaps beat the Ministers on the different clauses in the Committee; but then he likewise knew that what was done in Committee might be undone on bringing up the report. Take, for instance, this very 10*l.* clause. Assisted by the two noble Earls, the noble Baron, and his friends of the right rev. Bench, they might modify, or even get rid of it in Committee. But then they had heard of such a thing as a creation of Peers, and if peers were created, where should they be when the Report was brought up? If what he then said was heard by his noble friends, he was sure they would see that the mischief which they would perpetrate by agreeing to the second reading never could be repaired. It might, indeed, be said, that his Majesty would not be prevailed upon to make new Peers. Now, on that point, he must agree with his right rev. friend (the Bishop of Exeter), and differ from his right rev. friend the Bishop of London, who had gone out of his way to assert that his Majesty could create new Peers without infringing the privileges of the House of Lords. He should be a most undutiful subject, and utterly unforgetful of the many kindnesses which he had received from his present Majesty, and indeed from every member of his family, if he could for a moment suppose that his Majesty would condescend to trifle with the solemn compact which he had made in the presence of their Lordships and the country, and in the temple of his God. But kings were placed in more awful situations than ordinary individuals, and particularly a King of England in times so critical as the present. For there were periods when the Kings and even Queens of England might have officers of state about them, whose conduct in Parliament passed unscrutinized, but now they were deprived of all such independent officers, and all around them must wear the livery of the Ministry. He should never disapprove of a Minister depriving an individual holding a political office of his place, when that individual voted in opposition to the Minister. But when corruption was spoken of in the House of Lords, he would ask, could there be a better mode devised for corrupting that House, than the dismissal, not only of the officers of the King, but also of the Chamberlain of the Queen, for no other reason than their having given their votes conscientiously? [*Cheers and laughter.*] He was glad that the noble Lord, himself so sensitive to interruption, had shown his sense of the force of this last argument by endeavouring to interrupt him by his laughter, but such interruption would have little effect on one so accustomed as he was to public discussion. To return, however, from this digression. He was going to say before he was interrupted, that a king, not having any private friends with whom he could consult on public affairs, and, therefore, compelled to listen on all occasions to the advice of his Ministers, might be excused if he did that which under different circumstances he would be most reluctant to do. He, therefore, contended, that there was no security that the Bill would not be read a third time, if their Lordships unfortunately consented to read it a second time. For when a noble friend of his had asked the noble Earl opposite whether any new

Peers would be created or not, the House would recollect that no answer was given to the question. This was the more remarkable, as it was notorious that in another place one of the Cabinet Ministers had argued in favour of creating Peers. He could not bring himself to suppose that such an argument was merely used to the House of Commons: quite the contrary, the using of such an argument was a proof that it was in the contemplation of Ministers to persuade his Majesty to do the unconstitutional act of depriving one branch of the Legislature of that independence which it was absolutely necessary that it should enjoy, to discharge its duty faithfully to the country. He, therefore, again said, let not noble Lords suppose that they could alter this Bill in the Committee; for, if they had better founded hopes of making such alterations as they could wish in the Committee, they had no security that they would not be undone on bringing up the Report, and then, with a new House of Peers, created for the express purpose of carrying the Bill, it must inevitably be read a third time. He could not press this argument too strongly on their Lordships, when he saw so many of them eager to go into the Committee, and there amend the Bill. He told them frankly, that if they did not prevent the Bill from reaching the Committee, they would do mischief which they would never be able by any subsequent exertions to remedy. He was sorry to hear the opinion which had been expressed on this occasion by three right rev. Prelates. He was sorry that he had not the satisfaction of seeing them in their places. The case of one of them he thought desperate; the other two might, he thought, be reclaimed from the error of their ways, and brought back to vote against the second reading of the Bill. The right rev. Prelate to whom he had first alluded, and whose case he considered desperate, had expressed himself in very strong terms against this Bill, but had said that, not expecting any other Reform would be proposed, and, in point of fact, no other Reform having been proposed, he had found it necessary to make up his mind without delay. It then having struck him that a noble Duke had proposed a plan of Reform which suited all who had the welfare of the institutions of their country at heart, the right rev. Prelate said, that the plan of Reform came too late. He must beg leave to deny that assertion. The noble Duke's plan of Reform had not come too late. The right rev. Prelate had already had two days to consider it, and it could not be said to come too late, if it came one instant before the second reading of the Bill. But the right rev. Prelate "had made up his mind." The right rev. Prelate, had taken, he believed, a most distinguished degree at Cambridge, but, if on his examination, he had given so foolish an explanation of any question put to him, as he had given of his vote on this occasion, he was quite certain that the right rev. Prelate would have been at the bottom, and not at the top, of the list of honours of his year. "Made up his mind!" That House was, he thought, a deliberative assembly—but with such assertions it would not continue to be so long. The shadows even of coming events, as they were "casting before," were already beginning to alter its character. When right rev. Prelates avowed that they did not come within its walls to discuss questions fairly, but with minds made up, and conclusions already formed, when they avowed that they would not be turned from their determination by any arguments, however powerful, which might be addressed to them, the deliberative character of the assembly must be destroyed. He did hope that the right rev. Prelate would have considered all the arguments urged before making up his mind, and now when he knew that a Bill to which he could not object would be brought forward to promote Reform—would facilitate its entrance into Parliament by rejecting the Bill which the right rev. Prelate disapproved of, and which stood in the way of the one he approved of. Another right rev. Prelate had said, that if he could bring himself to suppose that there was that danger to be apprehended for the Church of Ireland which had been so ably stated by another right rev. Prelate, he for one would not support this Bill. He was astonished that his right rev. friend had forgotten—for he was certain that his right rev. friend once knew it—he was astonished that any man should for one moment lose sight of the fact, that the Protestant corporations in Ireland were created to protect Protestant interests there. Their Lordships had not the Irish Reform Bill then before them, but if they could judge of that Bill from the last, it did not require the intellect of that right rev. Prelate to see, that the Protestant interests in Ireland were wantonly destroyed; for though the freemen of corporations had the right of voting preserved to them, they would be swamped by the influx of Roman Catholic householders which this Bill would pour in upon them. Any one who recollected the state of Ireland from the reign of James 1st. down to the present day—any one who recollected the articles of union by which it was provided that these boroughs should be preserved—must see that they formed the bulwarks of the Church of Ireland, and that when they fell the Church must fall likewise. A noble Baron had said, that this Reform might touch the externals of the Bishops, but could not affect the Church itself: he was sure that the palaces of the Bishops, and the property of the church, were considered as the externals of the Bishops. These, then, would be touched. He did not want the authority of the noble Lord to show that the Church would not be affected; it was founded on the rock of ages—the gates of hell would not prevail against it. The Church itself was secure in the purity of its doctrines, and the excellence of its ministers. At the same time, as a debt of justice due to those excellent persons, its ministers, he wished to preserve for them the externals, and not only for them, but to operate as an encouragement to other men of talent and energies to enter into that profession, whose influence extended much beyond the individuals of whom it consisted. There were none of the dissenters of the country, not a single congregation in the country, who had not been improved in their morality by the doctrine and works of such men as Barrow and Taylor, and other dignitaries of our Church. A right rev. Prelate, from whom he was sorry to differ, had said, with less charity than he might have expected from him, that nobody could oppose the metropolitan clause of the Bill, who was not either factious or ignorant. He was surprised at this language, because he considered it totally unworthy of a Bishop, and scarcely creditable to a private gentleman. If, like that right rev. Prelate, he had supposed that the last Bill ought to have been read a second time, he should have felt it his duty to have come down to the House, and to have confirmed his opinion by his vote, and, he thought, that the right rev. Prelate had good reason to reproach himself for not having done so; for a speech coming from so able an individual must have produced some effect upon the division. It was unfortunate, too, that the opinion of the right rev. Prelate was known to nobody at the time, for he recollected well that the congregation of St. Ann's church, Soho, lost the benefit of a sermon from the right rev. Prelate, owing to a fear entertained by the churchwardens that his anti-Reforming propensities would procure him a very bad reception. A noble Marquis (the Marquis of Lansdown) had expressed his surprise at finding his (Lord Wynford's) right rev. friend (the Bishop of Exeter) acting the part of a recruiting serjeant, and endeavouring to win over supporters to the Duke of Buckingham's plan of Reform. He was sure that his Majesty's Ministers would be right glad if they could recruit the recruiting serjeant; and, he had no doubt, that if an archbishoprick were vacant, they would gladly offer it as a bounty to his right rev. friend. To proceed, however, it had been said by the noble Marquis to whom he had just alluded, that the evils which France had suffered during the revolution, arose from the want of Representation. Now France had her States General; they were in existence in 1789; and it was not till the year 1792 that the king was deprived of his authority. In that interval how did the States General conduct themselves? Just as a Reformed Parliament would do. In fact, the States General were a Reformed Parliament; for, in an evil hour, Louis 16th was persuaded to double the powers of the *tiers etat*, and to make them equal with the powers of the two other orders—the clergy and the nobility. It was, he would maintain, a Reformed Parliament that sent the king of France to prison, though not (be it remarked) before they had greeted him with applauses equal to those which had been bestowed upon our own Sovereign by the advocates of the Bill. What had been the consequence to France from the proceedings of their Reformed Parliament? Rebellion—civil war—a monarch's murder—the reign of anarchy and terror—the establishment of a military despotism—and, finally, the release of the unfortunate country from its iron bonds, by what he might be allowed to term a conquest. The Rebellion of 1640 in this country had heralded the way to the ascendancy of a Reformed Parliament, by whom the king was murdered, a tyrant established in his place, and the people reduced to the extremity of wretchedness. Such had been the effects produced by two Reformed Parliaments in this and the neighbouring nation; and he had adverted to the subject to show, that his right rev. friend was perfectly correct in asserting, that the noble Marquis had erred in saying that there was no Parliament in France. The noble Marquis had referred to the American government to illustrate the advantages arising to the State from the susceptibility of additions to the elective right. But where was the parallel between the United States and England? The framers of the American constitution had not to deal with an empire like ours—they had found the country divided into a number of separate colonies, which colonies they united by a federal compact. The noble Marquis said, that the Legislature of Britain did not adapt itself to the march of events; but so long as virtual Representation existed among us, so long would the Legislature possess the power of adapting itself to the altering circumstances of the country. Our position might be explained by using the similitude of wings which were greater than the body. Notwithstanding the superior magnitude of the wings, the warmth of life, and the energy of action, were equally distributed to both, and both were alike protected. The noble Marquis had also stated, that what they proposed to do was, to adapt old doctrines to new circumstances—a statement similar to that made by the noble Earl, who, in introducing the Bill, averred that it was based upon principles familiar to the Constitution, and that, in fact, they were only collecting them and applying them to a novel order of things. In answer to these professions, he must assert, that never had England witnessed, from the days of Alfred till now, such a constituency as it was proposed to create by means of this Bill. The noble Earl had argued, and referred to a book in support of his argument, that, by the common law, the right of voting in England lay in householders. He would deny the existence of this right, or that it was declared in any book whatever. He was aware that the Report of the Committee cited by the noble Earl, and which was known by the name of "Glanville's Report," set forth that the right of voting was not in freeholders solely, but in freeholders and householders; certainly not in any thing like 10*l.* householders, nor in householders alone, but in connexion with freeholders. Now, it was an extraordinary fact, that by this Bill freeholders were got rid of, and householders at 10*l.* a-year, or at nothing at all, substituted for them. He would take leave to refer to a book of as great authority as the Report referred to by the noble Earl, which went decidedly against the doctrine laid down by the noble Earl. He would adduce the authority of Maddox, who stated, that the right of voting was generally in freeholders, or in burgage-tenure residents—that it was different according to the different circumstances and situation of the voters. If the agricultural interest were to be protected, the voters were freeholders; if they were inhabitants of towns, they were freemen, or, like the voters of Preston, scot-and-lot voters. It was, however, absurd, the noble Lord said, to contend that any law or any sovereign, at any time, conferred the right of voting on all householders of the country. Sovereigns had, at different times, indeed, conferred the right of voting on such persons of the various classes of the community as they had deemed worthy of it, and in the end they had formed together the constituency which sent the Representatives of the people at present into Parliament. One of the doctrines that had been laid down in the course of the arguments on this Bill was, that the same party that had conferred a trust, had a right to recall that trust. This, certainly, was a very novel proposition; and he, for one, begged to protest against it. He denied that a trust could be recalled without good and sufficient cause being shown for that recall. To deprive the existing voters of their rights, would be to destroy the most valuable interests. He (Lord Wynford) had at that moment the right to purchase an advowson, and if he purchased it, and were subsequently deprived of it, that would be stripping him of his property against the law. This title, and the title to vote, were held as trusts, and they had no right to disfranchise the parties to whom the trusts were committed, until they had proved their incompetency to exercise them. Of course when there was proper evidence of that incompetency, the right might be taken away by a legislative enactment, like any other species of property. Here he would beg to make a remark on a statement made by the noble Earl on introducing the Bill to their Lordships' notice. The noble Earl laid it down that the two principles of disfranchisement and enfranchisement were inseparable from any measure introducing a change into the present constitution of Parliament. This he denied. He would contend that there might be many Reform measures of which those principles did not form a portion. The noble Earl had said much on the subject of the importance of giving Representatives to the manufacturing interests of the country. Undoubtedly, those interests were important, highly important; but if he were to compare the manufacturing with the agricultural interests, he had no hesitation in saying, that the latter were the more important, and the more deserving of adequate and full Representation in the other House of Parliament. But could it be said that the manufacturing interests were, under the present system, ill represented? Undoubtedly they were not. If their Lordships would look attentively into the constitution of the House of Commons as he had, they would find that, at the present moment, there were more Members in that House in the manufacturing than there were in the agricultural interests. This fact he could prove to demonstration, but would not then enter upon it. He confessed that his anticipations as to the consequences of that part of the measure which gave an increase of Members to the manufacturing interests, should it unfortunately pass into a law, were most gloomy; indeed, he was convinced that it would throw the whole legislative power of this country into the hands of the journeymen and lowest class of labourers. He had not the least hesitation in saying, that he would enter into the consideration of a moderate alteration in the constitution of Parliament, for he thought the natural change of events rendered a change of that description necessary. When the proposal of the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) came to be considered, he would willingly enter upon it; but he was prepared to say, that, when the Bill immediately before their Lordships passed into a law, there would be an end to the Constitution, not only of Parliament, but of the country. Having made these few remarks expressive of his general opinion on the subject of Reform, and the results which might be expected to ensue from the enactment of the measure before the House, he would, with the permission of their Lordships, take up that Bill, and refer them to some of its passages, with a view of demonstrating how completly it falsified its alleged object. In the preamble of the Bill, it was stated to be introduced for the purpose of amending the several abuses which had crept into the constitution of the House of Commons. Now, he begged to ask their Lordships, did they think that the Bill in its details touched upon all the abuses attendant upon the Representation of the people? He was prepared to contend that there were many abuses, and very striking abuses, which were not touched by the Bill. For instance, could any man assert, that bribery and corruption were prevented by the proposed Bill? Nay, he would go further, could any man deny, and denying prove, that the liability to bribery and corruption was not materially increased by the very nature of the details of this Bill? Indeed, so strongly was he impressed with this opinion that, should the Bill unfortunately go into Committee, he was resolved to move that, instead of its being entitled "A Bill to alter and amend the Representation of England and Wales," it should be called "A Bill to legalize and extend the system of bribery and corruption in the Representation of the Commons' House of Parliament." The preamble spoke of the necessity "of providing Representatives for large and considerable places;" to meet which necessity it was proposed to deprive of this right "many small and inconsiderable places." Now, he (Lord Wynford) did not know what right was vested in Parliament of depriving even inconsiderable places of their Representatives. If it could be proved that those places made an improper use of that privilege, then, undoubtedly, Parliament were justified in taking it from them; but until such were the case, they undoubtedly were not justified in taking it from one place, however inconsiderable, for the purpose of transferring it to another, no matter how considerable—particularly, too, when their Lordships took upon themselves to decide what places were inconsiderable, and what places were considerable. What, he desired to know, was to decide upon a place being inconsiderable? In many instances, their Lordships were called upon to term a borough "small and inconsiderable," although possessed of at least 300 voters. Nay, more, even considering that the rights of freemen were to be destroyed if their Lordships passed the present Bill, in agreeing to schedule A, they would be calling many places inconsiderable which under it would be possessed of 100 voters. He would undertake to show in Committee that there were several places so situated. Did not, he asked, the exercise of such a power as that which their Lordships were called upon to use, establish a most dangerous precedent? For his own part, he thought that it was such a power as would lead to the exercise of one which, if not more arbitrary, would be, if possible, more dangerous. The preamble of the Bill advocated the necessity of giving Representatives to large and populous places. He did not object to the right of Representation being bestowed on large and populous places, but he did object to their being represented at the expense and to the prejudice of other places which were as likely to exercise the right as purely—nay, if they were to judge from the extent of the franchise, and the increase of the constituency which the Bill would establish, he would say more purely—than those places upon which it was about to be bestowed. The Bill then proposed to increase the number of Knights of the Shire. But did it make that increase to the amount requisite to equipoise the town Representation? What was the number of Knights of the Shire? Not more than 150, and the Bill proposed to create in all upwards of 300 Representatives of towns. Such being the case, what chance of adequate Representation, he would be glad to know, would the landed interest have? How was that interest, at the present moment so much depressed and suffering, to assert its importance in a Parliament in which its Representation would be but as 157 to upwards of 300. In point of abstract numbers, independent of the change in the right of voting, and the proposed division of the counties, the agricultural interests would be in a minority; but, then, when these alterations were considered, could any man deny that the landed interests would be totally unrepresented? There were three new classes of voters established by this Bill—first, the copyholders, persons having no estate in inheritance; secondly, leaseholders of 10*l.* on leases of upwards of fifty years, and thirdly, leaseholders and tenants at will of 50*l.* a-year. He asked their Lordships, did they consider how those three descriptions of voters would abound in towns? And if so, what security would the agricultural interests have that they should meet with due Representation under the present Bill? Then, when they looked to the proposed division of counties, what was the prospect? Nothing could be more gloomy for the landed interests. Look to the county of Warwick. What would be the result of the dividing system in that county? Birmingham and Coventry, situated within twenty miles of each other, were in one division—the southern offering very little prospect of an equipoise to the northern, or agricultural division. When he stated to their Lordships that those two great towns were in the manufacturing district of the county, must it not be apparent that the agricultural interests would be outnumbered twice over by the Representation from the southern portion? There were many other counties showing a like preponderance of the manufacturing over the landed interests? In Somersetshire such would be the case. Bristol and Bath being in one, the eastern division, their Members combined with the district county Members, would altogether weigh down the Representation of the western, or agricultural division. Again, in the county of Kent, in the western district were Greenwich, Deptford, Woolwich, Rochester, Maidstone and Chatham, while, in the eastern division, there was nothing to counterbalance such an accumulation of town Representation. True there was one way of partially, if not completely, obviating this inequality—namely, by excluding the voters in towns from voting in the counties where such towns were situated, but until that was done he had a right to argue on the Bill as it then stood, not as it might be altered in Committee. It was said, that there was no difference in the 10*l.* franchise between small and large places; and upon this an argument was founded that the constituency of that class in towns would be as respectable and worthy as in counties. But could any man compare the workhouse pauper in a town, to the generally respectable tenant of a cottage in a country village? Again, looking to that same point, as it regarded the liability to bribery and corruption, was it possible to assert that the class of 10*l.* voters in towns would not be found more susceptible to the influence of a bribe, than the same class in counties? In a county, from both the comparative respectability of the voters and their paucity in numbers, an individual taking a bribe was noted and marked out; but if in a town constituency a man took a bribe, it was thought nothing of, for almost every one he met with was in a similar situation. The Bill likewise professed to diminish the expense at elections. Diminish expense! How? he begged to ask. Certainly not by the destruction of bribery; that it materially increased. How, then, he repeated, did it diminish expense? Why, it proposed to take the poll at fifteen places. Did that diminish expense? Unquestionably not. What constituted the principal items of expenditure in taking an election? Was it not the retaining of poll clerks and agents? And if instead of one poll, there were to be fifteen, the unfortunate candidate under the proposed Bill, independently of being obliged to bear his share in the erection of fifteen polling-booths, and returning officers, would have to retain fifteen sets of agents, and fifteen sets of poll clerks. And was this the vaunted diminution of expense? He submitted that so far from diminishing, the proposed alteration would have the effect of materially increasing that expenditure which already pressed heavily on those who had to stand contested elections. He had another objection to the proposed disfranchisement of boroughs, and that was, that they were not disfranchised for the purpose of enfranchising other English towns, but in order that the Representation of Ireland and Scotland might be increased. He had great respect for those two countries, with one of which he was intimately connected, but still he could not but object to any alteration being made in the Representation of England, for such a purpose as that of disturbing what he maintained was a well-settled balance between the three divisions of the empire. England had made bargains with Scotland and Ireland respectively as to the number of Representatives; and as they had flourished under that balance (if one of them had not, it was not attributable to the want of Representation) there was no reason for its alteration. But, independently of that consideration, had not Ireland and Scotland their due share of Representation, when weighed with England, as regarded their respective wealth and contribution to the revenue? If their Lordships looked to the proportionate amount of taxes which these countries paid, they would agree with him in thinking that neither Scotland nor Ireland were entitled to an increase in the number of its Representatives. He must further object to the proposed criterion of eligibility to the franchise. He maintained that taxation, and not valuation, ought to form the test of qualification to be inserted in the registry. In the latter case, the individual who was to prepare the registry had no evidence to act by, for he would be obliged, in most cases, to frame his return, not according to the amount which any indifferent person would give for the tenement, but according to whatever nominal value the claimant should choose to place on it. A right rev. Prelate had complained of appeals being made by noble Lords to the Bishops. He had never been in the habit of appealing to those right rev. Prelates, except for the purpose of putting them on their guard, or to show them in what manner their interests were likely to be affected. This course he had ever pursued, because he felt as strongly for the interests of the Church, as if he had the honour of being a Prelate connected with it. Now, when he spoke of the unequal and inefficient manner in which the landed interests were likely to be represented, he could not but feel that the interests of the Church were proportionably in danger of inadequate Representation. He did not, of course, mean that the Church itself was likely to be affected by it, but that its revenues, of which landed property was a considerable part, might be depreciated. It was unquestionable also that the Church of Ireland was likely to be much affected by the alteration proposed to be carried into effect. He would here also remark, that he thought as England, Ireland, and Scotland, were under one Government, instead of being made the subject of isolated measures, they ought to have been concentrated into one Bill, for it was impossible to judge accurately what would be the effect of one measure separately. He had said, that the Church of Ireland was likely to be much affected by the alteration in the franchise of that country. Now, he was prepared to contend, that the Church of Ireland could not fall without the Church of England and Scotland meeting with a like misfortune. From a great portion of the towns of Ireland Roman Catholics would be returned—a return the consequences of which it was easy to perceive. They would never be at rest until they succeeded in subverting the Church property of that country; or, if they failed in that, which he trusted they would, the consequence would be, that the Irish Protestants, a most deserving and loyal class, would be compelled to expatriate themselves. Now, here was a subject on which he would beg to appeal to the right. rev. Prelates. He would beg and entreat them to consider it. He looked at the interests of the Protestants of Ireland, and thought them as much entitled to protection as the Protestants of England; nay, to more, for the Protestants of Ireland were more likely to be oppressed; they were set up on high as it were, and, consequently, were more objects of attention, than those of England. Such was his opinion; and he was convinced it was the opinion of the right rev. Prelates to whom he addressed himself. He had next to speak of the interests of a set of men who were unrepresented in that, and the other House of Parliament. He meant the interests of the colonists in the East and West Indies. From the spirit that had already been manifested in some of the manufacturing districts respecting the abolition of slavery, a spirit excited by sectarians and fanatics, there was every reason to apprehend the introduction of such measures into a reformed Parliament as would cause the loss of those settlements, upon which, in consequence of the market they afforded for British manufactures, in a great measure depended the payment of the interest of the National Debt. When he considered the strong feeling which had already manifested itself, and combined with it the alteration in the constituency, he could not avoid entertaining a fear that a set of fanatical persons would be introduced into Parliament, pledged to the support of a measure, the inevitable result of which would be, the separation of the colonies from England—a result which must be fraught with the most momentous evils. The next topic on which he would remark was, the system of intimidation employed by a certain portion of the Press; and he must express his surprise and regret that his Majesty's Government had not taken means for the punishment of the would-be intimidators. He alluded particularly to a statement which had appeared in one of the leading Radical Journals, to the effect that if their Lordships evinced any intention of rejecting the Bill before the House, 100,000 men were to march up and compel their assent to it. Were such statements as these, he asked, to be suffered to pass unpunished? He was sorry that the members of his Majesty's Government, for their own sakes, had not thought proper to bring to punishment those who dared to circulate such a libel on the people of England. He, however, knew that their Lordships entertained but one fear—the fear of being suspected of being afraid. He was convinced that, laying aside all notions of self-interest and personal apprehension, their object in the decision they would give would be to look to the interests of the country, which were solemnly committed to their charge. He was still of opinion that a bit-by-bit Reform was the only safe means of introducing an alteration into the Constitution of Parliament. He had been long of that opinion, and in pursuance of it would have some time since introduced a measure of that description to their Lordships' notice, but that he thought such a measure ought to proceed from another place. He regretted much that the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) had so long delayed the proposition of which he had given notice, for it would have afforded many of their Lordships an opportunity of referring to a specific measure on the subject of Reform, and a reasonable excuse for rejecting the measure of his Majesty's Ministers. The Constitution of the country ought not to be left in the most extraordinary and most unsatisfactory situation to which it would be reduced, were their Lordships to suffer the Bill to pass. This was a law which was recommended to the favour of their Lordships, under the delusion that it was meant to increase the liberty of the subject; but he would say, that it abridged the liberties of 320,000 persons, of whom 132,000 would be deprived of their rights of voting. Notwithstanding this, the Bill proceeded upon the principles of freedom; it proffered liberty to all, whilst it actually went to disfranchise one-half of those who now possessed the constitutional right or qualification of voting. He would put it to their Lordships to say, what part of the empire would the Bill satisfy. Would it satisfy the large towns? Those who imagined anything of the sort, those who flattered themselves that the measure would quiet the public mind, and induce the people to acquiesce and rejoice in it as a final adjustment, would in the end find themselves most grievously mistaken. He only wished that noble Lords who thought that the Bill was likely to be the last arrangement upon the subject would watch attentively what had already been the proceedings upon the Bill amongst the societies of large and populous towns. He held in his hand the Resolutions which had been passed at a meeting of what was called a Political Union, and he would leave it to their Lordships to Judge by this sample how far the Bill was likely to satisfy the people. The Resolutions first inculcated that the working classes ought to avail themselves of all just means and of every fair opportunity to get rid of the tyranny of their masters and the manufacturers. This was a means by which it was hoped that journeymen would become masters, and masters and manufacturers be reduced to the condition of journeymen. From this, which was called getting rid of the tyranny of masters, the transition was to Parliamentary Reform. The Unionists accordingly set forth that, to obtain an effectual Reform in the Commons' House of Parliament, it was essential and indispensable that the people should insist upon annual elections, the extension of the Suffrage, the Vote by Ballot, and an essentially new qualification. The Unionists then set forth that they were thoroughly convinced that, until their Lordships acknowledged that the useful and productive classes ought to have the right of possessing seats in the House of Commons, it would be impossible to promote unanimity and concord among all classes, and to guide and direct the public, instead of leaving it in a state of discord. This was one of the documents which would enable their Lordships to see what sort of Parliamentary Reform would answer the expectations which the Bill had already given rise to among the people. The 10*l.* household franchise in large towns would give the right of voting to paupers, and extend pretty nearly to Universal Suffrage; but this would not do for the Political Unionists; they wanted annual Parliaments, the Vote by Ballot and Universal Suffrage throughout the Kingdom. Was this all they wanted? Would this satisfy the Reformers? No. They already told their Lordships that they wanted more, and would not be content until what they termed the working, useful, and productive classes, which in other terms meant the common people, were converted into law-makers and politicians in the Commons' House of Parliament. He must beg leave to observe that that was pretty nearly the sort of Representation which already existed in another quarter of the world, and it would be well if their Lordships knew how it worked. The description of the people to whom he had alluded would not be satisfied till they obtained the system of Representation which existed in North America. Such, he believed, was the state of Representation throughout the provinces of the Union, that, even where the state of society was extremely good the Representatives in Congress were made up of Attornies and the lower order of traders while men of a respectable rank could not succeed in their election. Would not this be the case in England were the Bill to pass? And he fervently hoped that it never would pass. There would not be in the House of Commons any gentlemen of fortune, any gentlemen having interest in the country, any gentlemen of an education which enabled them to discharge their duties in Parliament—no, there would be nothing in the Legislature of great Britain but the lower orders of society, such as the Political Union recommended in the Resolutions he had just taken the liberty of reading to the House. He had little pecuniary interest at stake in this question. He had but little property, nor at the age at which he had arrived could he expect to live to see the ruin which the Bill would produce; but though he might personally be less interested than others, though individually he might not have to dread the impending evil, he could not but feel deeply anxious for the institutions of his country, for the safety of persons, and the security of property; and he implored the House to consider what would be the fate of every sacred right and useful institution if they were placed under the guardianship and submitted to the direction of Representatives such as he had just described. If their Lordships were not convinced, if they wanted any further evidence upon the subject, he begged to refer them to a late number of the *North American Review* which would plainly show their Lordships what they had to expect from the spirit of innovation which was now so prevalent, and to which he was sorry to say that his Majesty's Ministers were giving all the efficacy in their power. They would be driven from one concession to another, until at last they would be obliged to establish republican institutions. He saw the spirit working, indeed, that man must be blind who could not see it. If the Bill were to pass into a law it would become a detailed curse upon the country—nothing would then be left of a House of Commons, whilst in its place would be substituted a democratic division of the kingdom into districts represented by delegates. He wished his voice to be heard beyond the walls of that House. One idea prevalent was, that the poor laws of England demanded Reform, or, in other words, annihilation. Yes, the spirit of Reform already cried for the suppression of those humane laws which rescued the poor from the support of casual and unwilling charity, and gave them a right to demand support by the Constitution of England. The pressure of the poor laws was to be destroyed by depriving the agriculturists of the fund out of which they arose. If the poor wanted food, if the destitution of age were to be unheeded, and the misery of sickness unrelieved, what to the poor would be the benefit of Parliamentary Reform, and what would be its effect upon the country? Such a visionary alteration was not called for by any necessity. Let the people look at France and Belgium, and learn what had been the effects of the sudden changes in the form of the Governments of those countries. Let them contemplate what had ensued even from the overturning of a Prince, who, perhaps, deserved to be overturned, because he violated every duty. Even in that case it would be found that it was thought better to preserve the ancient forms of Government, and yet what had been the result? From France let them travel to Belgium, and then ask the poor man if he could wish for Reform when Reform was followed by such disastrous changes? Let the poor next look at that country in which a system of Universal Suffrage already existed. In the town of Boston there were 2,000 paupers who got their daily bread by begging, and in this country there was not a single town of equal size which had yet fallen to such a condition, nor did he believe that such ever would be the case in England until the spirit of innovation should destroy all the rights and securities of property. If their Lordships were to pass the Bill, and which he implored them not to pass, they would not only sacrifice their own interests but those of their children, whilst the benefits of the Bill were professedly to fall on some unknown, some distant generation—a generation so distant that their Lordships could not be supposed to feel for their interests; and yet for this generation they were expected to sacrifice all that was immediately and dearly connected with them, and to whose protection they were bound by every moral and sacred obligation. He feared that he had trespassed by far too long upon their Lordships' attention, and yet he was apprehensive that he had omitted many things which he ought to have stated. Upon such a subject he was anxious to make no omissions. He felt the importance of the case most deeply, most earnestly. That the Bill never should pass into a law was his devout and fervent wish; and yet, should it pass, happy should he be if he found that it did not ruin all the best and dearest interests of the country—if it did not destroy the Government, the Church, and every thing valuable and conducive to the happiness of man. He was persuaded that the Bill was the step, the first step, that led to destruction; it placed every person in a position from which he must eventually fall. He felt that he had less interest in the State than most whom he now had the honour to address; he had little of life remaining, his course was nearly run, and perhaps this was the last time he should address the House; but in his last effort he felt a warmer anxiety for his country. If he could induce himself to think that the evils which the Bill professed to correct would be corrected, he would gladly vote for its going into Committee; but he was satisfied, thoroughly satisfied, that the very principle of the Bill was radically wrong. It began with gross and palpable injustice, and it attempted to do what was impossible. If he were right, the Bill would involve the country in destruction, and, would put an end to the happiness and the prosperity with which the people of England had been blessed under equal laws and a liberal Government. In opposing the Bill he felt that he had done his duty. He had examined its principles and had carefully investigated all its details, and he was bound, upon sincere conviction, to raise his firmest voice against its passing into a law. Perhaps that was the last time he should ever raise his voice within the walls of that House. He hoped that he had prevailed upon the Bench of right reverend Prelates. He had warned them, not upon their personal danger, for that they would disregard, but upon their duties to those whom they were placed in that House to protect and defend, and he trusted that they would be firm in resisting a measure fraught with such inevitable danger.

Lord *Durham* spoke to the following effect:*—My Lords not having had an opportunity, either of declaring my sentiments, or even giving a personal vote on this most important question, when it was before the House last, I naturally feel anxious to take advantage of the present moment, and trespass on your attention for a short space of time. I am the more desirous of doing so now, because, from the severe and painful indisposition under which I have lately laboured, and from which I am in fact still suffering, I fear that if I delay addressing your Lordships till a later period of this night's debate, I shall not have strength sufficient to enable me to avail myself of the indulgence of the House. I have listened with the greatest attention to the long, and may I be permitted to add, desultory speech of the noble and learned Lord (Wynford), who has just sat down; and I can assure him, that if any interruption came, during a part of that speech, from this side of the House, it was not with the view of impeding the course of the noble Lord's arguments, but merely for the purpose of setting him right as to the grounds on which those arguments were founded. As for the speech of the noble and learned Lord, it has embraced many topics and related to many subjects: but of these some are entirely unconnected with the question itself, and others with its present stage. In one portion, he alluded to the household of their Majesties; in another, to the inconsistency of the reverend Bench; in a third, to the state of the Irish Church; and in a fourth, to the state of the manufactures of India. The noble and learned Lord also entered into a long examination of the details of the Bill, into which I cannot follow him, because the principle of the Measure is alone under discussion at the present moment. Of this, indeed, the noble and learned Lord seemed to be fully aware himself, when he apologized for detaining your Lordships so long in discussing the clauses of the Bill, on the ground that, as we were not likely to go into a Committee, he should never have an opportunity of examining them. Now, as I feel certain that this Bill will go into a Committee, I must decline following a course so inconsistent with the rules and regulations of the House. My Lords, I must say, however, that the close and laborious attention which I paid to the noble and learned Lord's speech has been, in some degree, repaid by the pleasure of finding that he, at least, has not adopted that tone of party rancour and personal animosity towards his Majesty's Ministers which has, in so marked a manner, distinguished the debates of the two last nights. Very different, indeed, was the tone and temper of his speech from that which proceeded from the reverend Bench on the last night. Of that exhibition on the part of a rev. Bishop (Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter), I shall only say, that, if coarse and virulent invective—malignant and false insinuations—the grossest perversion of historical facts—decked out with all the choicest flowers of his well-known pamphleteering slang—

The Earl of *Winchilsea* rose to order.—He said he was extremely sorry to address their Lordships; but did it become that House—did it become any such august assembly, to deal in such violent personalities, to tolerate such personal invectives? Did it become their Lordships to sit patiently and hear such personalities, especially when they were addressed against an individual who, from his profession and situation, could not personally notice them?

Lord *Holland* said, the noble Earl had spoken to order.—He wished, therefore, to know what was the Motion he had made. The question before the House was a question of order, and he had yet to learn what that question was. If the noble Earl meant to speak to order in an orderly manner, there was a mode, according to the usages of the House, by which he could proceed in his intentions; and he trusted that the noble Earl would attend to the rule of the House, which was, in such a case, to move that the objectionable words be taken down.

The Earl of *Winchilsea:* The words I rose to order upon are, "pamphleteering slang and false insinuations." I move that these words be taken down.

Earl *Grey* said, that although the words

---

* Printed from the corrected edition, published by Ridgway.

"pamphleteering slang and false insinuations" were harsh in sound, their precise meaning must depend very much on the context, and the manner in which they were placed in the sentence. Suppose the noble Earl had himself made use of the word false insinuation, he might have meant only that a speech had been full of false deductions, from mistaken, or even correct premises. If his (Earl Grey's) recollection did not fail him, the words which had been said were, pamphleteering slang—he spoke in the usual flowers of pamphleteering slang. He did not know that there was any thing out of order in words bearing such a meaning. If the noble Earl really were serious in his wish to have the words taken down, he must not confine himself to only the words, but he must move that the whole sentence be taken down, and after it was taken down, he might then call upon the Speaker to explain the objectionable words, and proceed with any motion upon the subject, according to his discretion.

Lord *Holland* conceived that the real, and, in fact, the only, parliamentary proceeding in this case was, to have the sentence taken down. The words objected to must then be put to the noble Lord who used them, and he must be then asked how he meant to apply them.

The Duke of *Buckingham* felt convinced that the noble Lord would not have used the words deliberately to any noble Peer, much less to a person not in a situation to take notice of them. In the spirit of peace and good will, in a wish that their Lordships' discussions should be carried on without offence to any body, he did personally request the noble Lord to reconsider what he had said, without the words being taken down. He was sure that the noble Lord, in his calmer moments, would not persevere in such an imputation against the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Exeter).

Lord *Durham* continued as follows:—My Lords, I was interrupted by the noble Earl in the course of a sentence I was addressing to your Lordships, and it now seems to be his intention that the words which I uttered should be taken down. I have not the slightest objection to that course being adopted—but the contrary—and I now state to your Lordships the reasons which induced me to use those words. I shall not stop to inquire whether the words "pamphleteering slang" were the most elegant which I could have used. They do not, perhaps, suit the noble Earl's taste; but they are the only words which I consider can correctly describe the speech of the rev. Bishop (Phillpotts). Now, as to the words "malignant and false insinuations" The noble Duke (Buckingham), who wishes me to retract them, must, I am sure, well recollect that that rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Exeter), in the course of his harangue, insinuated that some of his Majesty's Ministers were unbecomingly connected with the Press. From the terms in which that insinuation was couched, I could have no doubt that he alluded to me. It would be gross affectation in me to deny it—the more especially as I had been previously told by those who had read those papers, that the same charge had been made against me, by name, in those weekly publications which are so notorious for their scurrility and indecency. When, therefore, I found that charge repeated in this House, in terms which neither I, nor any man living could misunderstand, I determined to take the earliest opportunity of stating to your Lordships that it was as false as scandalous. I now repeat that declaration, and pause for the purpose of giving any noble Lord an opportunity of taking down my words. Lord Durham then resumed his seat for a moment, but as no noble Lord rose, he proceeded to say—

My Lords,—As it seems no further interruption is to be offered me, I shall dismiss the subject by saying, that I never will shrink from the opportunity of meeting before this House, or my country, any charges or insinuations which may be directed against me, from whatever quarter they may proceed. If I have expressed myself somewhat earnestly and warmly, your Lordships will, I am sure, deem me justified, when you reflect that, to all the tortures of an afflicted mind, have been of late superadded calumnies of the basest description, calculated to wound not only my own feelings, but those of all who are dearest to me:—but I now return to the Question, from which I have been diverted by the interruption of the noble Earl. My Lords, we have been charged by a noble and gallant Duke (the Duke of Wellington), and a noble Earl who sits on the third bench (the Earl of Mansfield), with having created that excitement in the public mind which led to that general demand for Reform, which is now admitted to prevail by many of those who formerly denied its existence. On what facts those noble Lords found their assertion, I cannot comprehend. If there is any one subject which more than another has been discussed, both in and out of Parliament, especially within the last fifty years, it has been that of a Reform in the Representation of the people. From the Revolution, it has been advocated by the most eminent men of which this country can boast. From the year 1783, when the celebrated Yorkshire petition was presented, it has never been lost sight of by the people; taken up, it is true, with more or less energy, according to the circumstances of the times—but always holding a high place in their estimation, and connected by them with the most vital interests of the country. It was brought under the notice of Parliament by the Duke of Richmond, in 1780;—Mr. Pitt, in 1782, 1783, and 1784;—and subsequently by Mr. Flood, my noble relation at the head of the Government, Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Brand, Lord Archibald Hamilton, Lord John Russell, and many others. The noble and gallant Duke, therefore, is not supported by facts, when he says, the feeling is one of late growth; and still less when he says, that it is owing to the examples of the French and Belgian Revolutions of 1830. That it has assumed a much more formidable appearance within these last four or five years is true; but not owing to the causes alleged by the noble and gallant Duke. In my opinion, it has been owing, in a great measure, to the repeated refusals of your Lordships to grant Representation to the great towns of Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham, when the fitting opportunities were afforded you; it has also arisen from the exposures which took place in the parliamentary inquiries relative to Grampound, Penryn, and East Retford, laying bare scenes of the grossest political profligacy and corruption; but above all, my Lords, it has been in consequence of the great mass of the middle classes having at length identified themselves with this question. To this part of the subject I particularly wish to call your Lordships' attention, not only because I think its full consideration involves one of the great and leading principles of the Bill—I mean the emancipation of those classes—but because it will account, in the only satisfactory mode for the intensity of feeling with which this measure has been received; and will demonstrate the improbability of the country being satisfied with any less degree of Reform than that which is afforded them by this Bill. Your Lordships are, no doubt, too well read in the history of your country not to be aware, that, up to the Revolution of 1688, the object of each successive struggle was, to prevent the Sovereign from obtaining despotic power. At that period the Crown was defeated, and has ever since been dependent on, and at the mercy of, two parties of the higher orders—between whom the contest for political power has been bitter and incessant—whilst the people were well or ill governed, according to the principles of the party which was predominant. For a long time, the people acquiesced in the supremacy of the higher orders, and their exclusive possession of political privileges. Conscious of their own incompetency, from want of education, to enjoy those privileges, they felt no jealousy, and offered no opposition to the monopoly vested in their superiors. But, my Lords, a great change has taken place within the last fifty years in the state of society. The two extremes have been gradually meeting—the one standing still, whilst the other has been gradually improving. It cannot be concealed, that the middle classes have increased, of late, in skill, talent, political intelligence, and wealth, to such an extent, that they are, and feel that they are, competent to the performance of higher duties. They thus, naturally enough, feel ambitious to be no longer excluded from their fair share of political power: and the result of their continued exclusion must be a political convulsion—and necessarily a destructive one—for the unnatural compression of great power by insufficient means, always ends not only in the annihilation of the feeble bonds which restrain it, but in the destruction of all that is within the range of its explosion.

That the middle classes have a right to indulge in these feelings, no accurate observer of the state of society can deny. The noble Duke opposite, the proprietor of St. Mawe's, (the Duke of Buckingham) has thought proper to describe them as paupers—as beggars. So far from this being the fact, their wealth more than doubles, nearly trebles that of the higher orders.* As for their intelligence

---

* In 1814, Colquhoun estimated the income of the productive classes at 292,555,147*l.*—that of the unproductive, at 137,966,225*l.*

—look at all the great towns of the empire—this metropolis, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, Liverpool, Newcastle, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and many others—and by whom will you find the scientific institutions, the literary societies, the charities—in short, all associations tending to the advancement of arts, literature, and of science, and to the amelioration of the human kind—by whom will you find them supported?—by whose example and whose purse maintained? By the middle classes.

The gentry, living apart in the country, enjoy the luxuries and amusements peculiar to their class, but mix neither in the pursuits or relaxations of their neighbours in the towns. Whenever they are brought together in public meetings, on political occasions, their superiority in learning or intellect is no longer manifest—the reverse is the fact; and I can assure the noble Baron (Ellenborough), that whether he is right or wrong in the opinion he entertains, with regard to the inferiority of intellect displayed by the newly-returned Members, if he were to attend any of the meetings of the middle classes, and enter into a discussion with them on political or scientific subjects, he would have no reason to plume himself on his fancied superiority. This being the case, then, the question is naturally asked, is that a fit and proper state of the Constitution, which excludes from the enjoyment of political power and privileges a large body of men, possessed of talents, skill, and wealth, merely because they do not happen to be included in a particular class, endowed with privileges bestowed upon them in different times, and different circumstances? I contend, therefore, my Lords, that these feelings alone would be sufficient to induce the people to desire that the advantages, as well as the burthens, of the Constitution should be extended to them. But were there no other reasons? Did the working of the Constitution, in its present exclusive state, produce no other mischievous effects than their exclusion? Did those who virtually represented them—as the noble and learned Lord (Wynford) says—did they perform the duties of their trust advantageously to the country? The answer, my Lords, which the people give to theseq uesions is, and always has been, in the negative. I can accumulate proofs upon proofs of the correctness of this assertion—a few will suffice. It appears, that when this corrupt parliamentary system first came into operation—I mean shortly after the Revolution—the National Debt amounted to 16,000,000*l.*; at the end of the last war, in 1814, it had risen very nearly to 800,000,000*l.* The national expenditure had increased, during that time, from 5,600,000*l.* to more than 94,000,000*l.*; the poor rates from 1,000,000*l.* to 7,000,000*l.* In one reign alone, that of George 3rd, 27,000,000*l.* were lavished in subsidies to all the great powers of the continent.* In the same period, the naval and military expenditure amounted to 928,000,000*l.* — that is to say, the luxury of indulging in war cost this country a sum little less than one thousand millions. All these proofs of an unlimited and unchecked expenditure, and many others,† which I need not now detail, became known to the people at the conclusion of the war. Great distress followed —much discontent and loud complaints prevailed — and how were they met? by conciliation or concession? No—by every species of repressive and coercive enactment. Measures for preventing the exercise of public meetings and petitioning —for fettering the Press—for suspending the Habeas Corpus Act — for granting indemnity bills — were successively proposed to the House of Commons, and immediately adopted by that assembly. These proceedings seem, if I may judge

---

* Austria	£7,070,000
Prussia	1,683,000
Russia	1,952,000
Sicily	2,300,000
Sweden	2,706,673
Spain	2,637,831
Ditto	673,441
Portugal	8,380,000
	£27,402,945

exclusive of 4,000,000*l.* granted to French, Corsican, and Toulouse emigrants — French clergy — St. Domingo, Russian, Portuguese sufferers, &c. &c.

† Sir James Graham subsequently brought before Parliament another instance of the working of the present system — the sums annually paid to Privy Councillors. He proved that of these 169 persons, 113 received 650,164*l.* per annum; of which 86,103*l.* were for sinecures — 121,650*l.* for pensions — and 442,333*l.* for active services. Of these—thirty were pluralists, receiving 221,133*l.* per annum; forty-seven were Peers, receiving 378,300*l.* per annum;—and twenty-two were Members of the House of Commons, receiving 90,849*l.* per annum.

from their cheers, to be approved of by the noble Lords opposite;—they were not grateful to the people, I can assure them—who, seeing their liberties attacked, and their resources squandered, through the instrumentality of a House of Commons, theoretically the guardian of both, naturally directed their attention to the mode in which that House was chosen, which neither represented their feelings nor protected their interests. The picture which was then presented to them was no less startling and disgusting than that of the state of their finances, to which I have just alluded. They found one portion nominated by Peers—a second by Commoners—a third by trafficking attornies, selling seats to the highest bidder—a fourth owing its return to the most unblushing bribery and corruption—in one part of the empire a Park, with no population at all, or at least of the smallest kind, returning two Members—in another, a large and important town, with hundreds of thousands of inhabitants, with no representation at all—and even that small part of the House still dependent on the public voice, so fettered and circumscribed by the immense expenditure required, as to be virtually placed in the hands of a very small class. My Lords, all this led to that state of things which has been so prophetically and so accurately described by a celebrated, writer, whose name is so familiar to noble Lords opposite, and whose opinions are generally so pleasing to them, that I make no apology for substituting his glowing words for my feeble expressions. Mr. Burke says:—

'An addressing House of Commons, 'and a petitioning nation—a House of 'Commons full of confidence, when the 'nation is plunged in despair—in the ut'most harmony with Ministers, whom the 'people regard with the utmost abhor'rence—who vote thanks, when the pub'lic opinion calls upon them for impeach'ments—who are eager to grant, when the 'general voice demands account—who, 'in all disputes between the people and 'the Administration presume against the 'people—who punish their disorders, but re'fuse even to inquire into the provocations to 'them—this is an unnatural, a monstrous 'state of things in this Constitution.

'Such an assembly may be a great, wise, 'awful Senate—but it is not, to any popu'lar purpose, a House of Commons.'

My Lords, I think that I have now stated sufficient reasons to account for the general prevalence of that desire for Reform which now exists, and to show that it did not owe its origin, either to our instigation, or to the French and Belgian Revolutions, as stated by the noble and gallant Duke opposite (Wellington)—at all events, of this I am quite confident—that to whatever causes it is to be ascribed, it can never be allayed or removed by any other mode than that of a full and generous compliance with the wishes of the people. Here, however, I am met by the noble Lords opposite, who talk so loudly of the dangers of concession, and the safety of resistance—and by the reverend Bishop (Phillpotts), who preaches to us the necessity of leaving the consequences to God. My Lords, I say nothing of the impropriety of those constant appeals to that sacred name, in this place—especially from such a quarter—but I ask, is history to be for ever a sealed book to those noble Lords? Are its pages to be for ever perverted by the reverend Bishop (Phillpotts)? Do they not teem with instances of the folly and inutility of resistance to the determined wishes of the people, intent on the acquirement or restoration of their rights? When the consequences have been left to Providence, has that resistance ever produced any thing but a postponement of those claims always to be renewed with increased vigour, and ultimately attended with complete success? My Lords, I assert that the Revolution of 1641, the French Revolution of 1785, and the separation of the North American Colonies—as was truly observed by the noble Baron on the cross benches (Wharncliffe), might all have been averted by timely and wise concession. Can any man, with the slightest knowledge of our history, attempt to persuade me, that if Charles 1st after conceding the Petition of Rights, had kept his faith with his people, he would not have saved his crown and his life? The noble Duke (Buckingham), who alluded on the last night to the fate of this king, argued on what occurred at a subsequent time, when all concessions were rendered useless by Charles's repeated acts of treachery—and his unconstitutional and illegal violations of the rights and liberties of his subjects. I refer to the first stage of these unhappy proceedings, when, by wise and honest measures, the monarchy might have been strengthened and consolidated. Again, with reference to the French Revolution, I say, that if Louis 16th had adopted the advice given him by his Ministers, the people would have been satisfied—the ancient institutions of the country ameliorated—the altar, the throne, and the aristocracy, preserved from the horrible fate which afterwards befel them. Twice had Louis 16th opportunities—first, under Turgot's ministry; secondly, under Necker's—of conciliating the country, and averting that fatal catastrophe, by limited concessions. The nobility resisted—and the Revolution followed. The noble Baron (Wharncliffe) has so ably detailed you the impolicy of our resistance to the claims of the North American Colonies, that I need only add to his powerful argument my own conviction, that if, after the Repeal of the Stamp Act, England had not destroyed all the benefit of that concession, by the Declaratory Act, and the re-imposition of the Tea Duties, North America would at this hour have been a portion of the British empire. My Lords, I repeat, therefore, fortified by these examples, that when the consequences have been left to Providence, according to the suggestion of the reverend Bishop (Phillpotts), the course of events has always been uniform—in the first instance, bigotted resistance to the claims of the people—in the second, bloody and protracted struggles—and finally, but invariably, unlimited, disgraceful, but then useless concession.

But, My Lords, have those of you who talk of resistance, calculated the comparative amount of forces which are arranged on each side? On the one hand, are arrayed the Crown, the House of Commons, and the People—on the other, not 200 Peers—if a majority, at least a bare one of this House. Now, my Lords, supposing that you reject this Bill a second time—and supposing that the people acquiesce quietly in your decision, and that their feelings of disappointment do not break out in open tumult and violence; will there be no punishment to you in the utter separation, which must take place, between you and your fellow country-men? In the sentence of excommunication which they will pass upon you—are you prepared to live in solitude in the midst of multitudes—your mansions fortified with cannon, (as was lately that of the noble Duke of Newcastle)—and protected by troops of faithful, perhaps, but if the hour of danger come, useless retainers? Surely there must be something in this state of things most revolting to the habits and feelings of a British Peer—and yet these are the most favourable circumstances which can follow the second rejection of this Bill. I see before me many noble Lords, who pride themselves on the cordiality of their intercourse with all around them, in the country, both rich and poor; whose presence there is generally welcomed by the congratulations of their neighbours, of all ranks—will those noble Lords receive with equal complacency the greetings they will have to encounter after having destroyed the long cherished hopes of their fellow countrymen? No, my Lords, I fear the change between confidence and distrust, affection and hatred, will be so great, that the satisfaction of having preserved nomination boroughs for a time—and for a time only—will but ill console them for the annoyances and expressions of dislike and aversion which will be heaped on them on all sides. I contend, therefore, that resistance must produce the very worst consequences, tending to destroy that harmony and good-will among all classes of society, which are so essential in every well-governed state—and especially in this country where all should be

"Not equal—yet free,
Equally free—for orders and degrees
Jar not with Liberty, but well consist."

My Lords, it was under this conviction, and believing as I did, and still do, that the claims of the people of this country were not to be trifled or tampered with by any Ministers—it was under this persuasion, that I for one, and I believe all my colleagues, came to the consideration of this measure—and were anxious to frame such a Bill, as, by its large and comprehensive provisions, might not only give general satisfaction, but, at the same time, set this question finally at rest. Into a detailed examination of those provisions, this, as I have already said, is not the fit opportunity for entering. They have, moreover, together with the alterations which have taken place, been so ably and fully detailed by my noble relation, who moved the second reading of this Bill, that I need not say more than that its leading principles are, as in the former Bill—the disfranchisement of all nomination boroughs—the purification of the lesser boroughs—the enfranchisement of the great and populous towns—the emancipation of the middle classes—and the diminution of the expense of elections.

There is, however, one portion of the details to which a noble Marquis (the Marquis of Londonderry) alluded on a former night, with which I am personally connected, and therefore your Lordships must permit me shortly to refer to them. The noble Marquis was pleased to accuse me, for whom he professed private respect and esteem, of having been a party to a gross job. How the noble Lord can entertain any respect or esteem for a person whom he supposes to have been guilty of such improper conduct, I certainly am at a loss to conceive. I can assure him, and your Lordships, that I never could respect myself, if I felt for a moment that I had been guilty of, or accessory to, any such proceeding. My Lords, I will not retaliate—I will not make use of any such harsh expressions, in return, towards the noble Marquis, with whom formerly I lived on terms of personal friendship; but I must beg leave to tell him, that when the provisions of this Bill are closely and fairly investigated, it will be found that the privileges which are extended to the county of Durham can be justified to their fullest extent, on those principles of wealth and population which have been taken as the tests for enfranchisement in this Bill—nay, more, I pledge myself to prove, that they do not even border on the limits within which other towns and counties have derived the benefit of Representation—and that if you were to strike them out, you would also have to disfranchise many others now included, but inferior to them in population and wealth. I solemnly disclaim any wish or intention to procure for myself any personal advantage or influence whatever. I should be ashamed of myself if I had entertained any such desire—and if I had—the attempt would have been futile, for the constituency to be created is so numerous, intelligent, and independent, as to be above all influence, either of mine or any other person.

Here I shall take the opportunity of briefly noticing the statement made the other night by the noble and gallant Duke (the Duke of Wellington), with respect to Christ Church and Tavistock. My Lords, the observations made by the noble Duke, would lead to the impression, that Tavistock had received an unfair preference. Such, perhaps, was not the object of the noble Duke, when he made those remarks; but it undoubtedly was that of the person from whom he received the statement. That calculation, unexplained, would lead your Lordships to imagine that the return of population, assessed taxes, and houses, quoted by the noble Duke related to the two boroughs at the time when the question of their disfranchisement had to be determined. That is not the fact—those returns related to the enlarged boundaries made subsequently by the Commissioners. At the time of disfranchisement, Tavistock had a population of 4,388, 626 houses, 1,124*l.* 15*s.* 9*d.* assessed taxes, 269 10*l.* houses; Christchurch had a population of 2,262, 516 houses, 733*l.* 12. 3*d.* assessed taxes, 191 10*l.* houses. The comparison, therefore, of the enlarged borough of Tavistock, with the enlarged borough of Christchurch, has nothing to do with the question of disfranchisement, which could not have been decided in any other way without violating every principle of fairness and justice.

Before I conclude, my Lords, I must notice an objection to this Bill, made by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Wynford), who preceded me this night. He says, that the expense of contested elections will be greatly increased by this Bill, because all who know anything of the nature of that expense must be aware that it chiefly arises from the charges made on account of agents and Poll Clerks; and, therefore, as the polling places are greatly multiplied, a greater expenditure will be proportionably required. My Lords, I differ with the noble and learned Lord entirely. I have had the honour—and certainly a very expensive one—to stand a severe contest for the Representation of the county of Durham. It cost me, as I once told your Lordships before, no less a sum than 30,000*l.*—and I believe, a noble friend behind me, a noble Marquis (the Marquis of Cleveland), could give your Lordships some further information, as to the sums of money lavished at that election, it having cost him also, I fear, rather more than the sum I have mentioned. I have, therefore, had some experience on this point—and I can assure the noble and learned Lord that the main and great expense arises in bringing up voters from a distance, and in paying for their legal subsistence at the county town, until they have polled. During the whole time that the election lasted, the legal entertainment of the voters cost me 1,000*l.* a-day. I, therefore, must contend, that, by appointing polling places in different parts of the county, we shall take away the necessity for incurring these heavy charges for travelling and subsistence, and therefore materially, if not entirely, diminish the great expenditure now required. My Lords, there are many other topics to which the noble and learned Lord has alluded, but which cannot, I repeat, be properly debated except in the Committee. I must therefore postpone any notice of them until that period—with this declaration merely—that there are no persons more anxious than his Majesty's Ministers that the provisions of the Bill should undergo the severest scrutiny—or more desirous to remove any well-grounded objections which may be fairly urged against them.

For all these reasons, my Lords, which I have ventured to submit to your consideration, I implore you to consent to the second reading of a Bill—the object of which is—to give security to the Throne—contentment to the people—and permanence to all the best institutions of the country—and shall now conclude, by saying in the words of that illustrious Statesman, whose principles I venerate, and whose example I have endeavoured to follow, although at a humble distance, throughout the whole course of my political life—I mean Mr. Fox—' We risk ' our all upon the excellence of this Bill. ' We risk upon it whatever is most dear to ' us, whatever men most value—the cha- ' racter of integrity, of honour, of present ' reputation and future fame—these and ' whatever else is precious to us, we stake ' on the constitutional safety—the en- ' larged policy—the equity—and wisdom ' of this measure.'

The Bishop of *Exeter:* I have been charged, my Lords, by the noble Baron, with having made a malignant and false insinuation; I must, therefore, beg permission of your Lordships to explain a part of what I said on a former night. As well as I can remember, speaking of *The Times* newspaper, I said that I supposed it was in some way or other connected with Government. The exact words I used are not present to my mind, but they were something about certain articles, breathing the inspiration—not of the Treasury, because I acquitted the noble Lord at the head of it of any connexion with *The Times* [*Laughter from the Ministerial benches*]. What I say seems sport to noble Lords near me, and I hope it will not be thought a very serious matter to myself. When I gave utterance to what has been the subject of remark, I by no means meant to fix upon any individual in particular; but in my own mind I did think that the rumours respecting the noble Baron were not unlikely to be in some degree true. [*Some noble Lords required the Bishop to speak out.*] I will endeavour to speak up so as to be heard, but it is my misfortune not to have many friends near me, excepting the right rev. friends by whom I am surrounded. The noble Marquis (we believe Clanricarde), if he has anything to say, ought to speak so that I may answer him. I assure the noble Baron that I was not anxious to press upon the notice of the House the particular part of my speech which he refers to. I spoke generally, because, I fairly own, I had not evidence beyond apparent probability. But, while I did not wish directly to charge the noble Baron, give me leave to say, that what I alluded to was not the only occasion on which there has been an apparent connexion between the Government and the newspapers. One instance weighs with me more strongly than it may with the noble Marquis. About five or six weeks ago—[“*order, order!*”] A charge has been made against me, and, if not irregular, I wish to advert to it—there was a statement in *The Times* newspaper regarding a correspondence with the noble Duke whom I see opposite (the duke of Buckingham)—I hope he will forgive my speaking of it in this way in his presence; and it is my earnest hope that he will contradict me if I state what is untrue, and correct me if I state what is improper. About the 23rd of January, or some such period, there was a direct allusion in *The Times* to a supposed correspondence between that noble Duke and his Majesty, as well as between a noble Duke and his Majesty's Secretary. The nature of the correspondence appeared to be stated with such particularity, that, if it were at all true, it seemed to me that the information must have gone to the newspaper from some person who had had access to the correspondence. It seemed to me also more probable that it should have found its way to the public from some Member of his Majesty's Government than from the noble Duke. Most certainly I have no hesitation in saying, that it does appear to me that it must have gone to the newspapers through some person who had access to the Government papers.

The Duke of *Buckingham:* My Lords, all I have to say is, that, in my capacity as a Peer of the realm, I did write the letter alluded to by the right rev. Prelate; and, in the exercise of my constitutional right, I transmitted it to his Majesty, through his Majesty's Secretary, in the usual and regular way. That letter I gave no copy of, and I read it only to two members of my own family, to the Illustrious Duke near me (Wellington), and to one other person. Certainly part of my letter —part of that letter which I placed in the hands of the King's Minister, was inserted *verbatim* in *The Times* newspaper.

Earl *Grey:* I am very sorry that a debate of this nature should be interrupted by such a discussion; but, after what has been said by the noble Duke—more particularly after the manner in which his statement has been received on the opposite side—I think the House will admit, that it is impossible for me to remain altogether silent. The fact, as stated by the noble Duke, is perfectly true. He did address a letter to the King, which was conveyed through one of his Majesty's Secretaries, offering advice on a political question then pending. That, says the noble Duke, was the proper and constitutional course: whether it was or was not, I will not now inquire; but I must say, that the conduct of his Majesty on the occasion was that of a Constitutional Sovereign. He immediately transmitted it to his Minister: it was sent to me. The noble Duke says that he kept no copy of it.

The Duke of *Buckingham:* I did not say that I kept no copy of it; but that I gave no copy of it.

Earl *Grey:* The noble Duke gave no copy of it, and I can say, upon my honour as a Peer, that I gave none. I certainly did communicate it to my colleagues: it was my duty to do it; and I think I can say for them, as I assert for myself, that it was not from them, nor from any person connected with them, that any part of the letter, any allusion to it, or abstract of it, found its way into the public papers. No person was more astonished than I was when I saw an allusion to it. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to say more upon this subject; but I can safely say, that what was printed did not proceed from his Majesty's advisers. This, my Lords, is the sole ground of the insinuation; and, with respect to the insinuated charge that Ministers have influenced the newspapers, all I can say is, that I should have been sorry to have thrown out such an insinuation upon such grounds, and still more to have defended it afterwards —I will not say in a Jesuitical way, for the right rev. Prelate abhors the Jesuits— but in a manner rather aggravating the original insinuation. As a person standing in an ostensible situation in the Government, I disclaim any connection with any one publication, and I most distinctly deny that I have done anything to influence a single newspaper. This I must add, as regards myself personally; and as to the particular paper in question, those who have seen it during the last month, and who have read its attacks upon me, will not think that I need enter into any disclaimer of the remotest concern with it. But the right rev. Prelate said, on the former night, that he had heard these things, and he believed them. I understood him to say that he believed them; but, if I am mistaken, I beg his pardon.

The Bishop of *Exeter:* I did not say that I believed them, but that they had been believed.

Earl *Grey:* That they have been believed! I certainly understood the right rev. Prelate to express the impression on his own mind that there was truth in the charge. He has undoubtedly said that there were insinuations against other Members of the King's Government, and he added, that he had heard a story of my noble friend near me (Lord Durham). Now, mark the charity of the right rev. Prelate—I say, mark his charity—mark what he does not think improbable!—that my noble friend near me, connected with me not only by the bonds of office, but by the nearest, dearest, and closest ties of relationship, has been guilty not merely of fraud, but falsehood, and has secretly and insidiously furnished newspapers with the means of attack upon the very Government of which he is a Member. That this he was ready to do, and actually did, at the expense of tearing asunder the tenderest and dearest ties of affection. If this be charity—if this be the charity of a Christian Bishop, I am much deceived in the true nature of that virtue. On this subject I have trespassed on the patience of the House not willingly. I have been driven to it; my feelings have been strongly excited, and I could not refrain from repelling an insinuation which I will not characterize further than by saying, that I little expected it from any noble Lord, but least of all from one who sits upon that Bench.

The Bishop of *Exeter:* I rise only to explain. I never meant to charge the noble Baron with communicating any particulars to *The Times;* but I said that there was an apparent general connection between that paper and the Ministry. If a declaration of what was passing in the inner mind be extorted from it, it is a little too much to say that I meant it for an insinuation. I declared from the first that I did not mean to charge the noble Baron with any particulars, although I seem to have been mistaken by the noble Marquis near me. Some of my right rev. friends did not even think that I alluded at all to the noble Baron.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* implored, that, if order were to be enforced, it might be observed fairly on both sides of the House. He begged leave to explain what he had said regarding the manner in which Durham had been dealt with in the Reform Bill. He did not mean to accuse the noble Baron (Durham), but to complain of a preponderating desire, on the part of the Government, to promote the interests of that fortunate county. His remark entirely had reference to political grounds: he had neither made, nor intended to make, any charge against an individual.

The Duke of *Wellington* also begged leave to say, that his complaint, of Tavistock having been more favoured by the Bill than Christchurch, was not meant in a personally offensive sense.

Lord *Durham* was willing to give both the noble Lords credit for not being actuated by feelings of personal hostility, but still found it difficult to reconcile their language with their professions. If the noble Duke was wholly uninfluenced by personal considerations, he might easily have selected a town mentioned in the Bill, approaching more closely to Christchurch, in comparison to wealth and population, than Tavistock: Thetford, for example.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, he must concur with the noble Lord who had just sat down, that it was most desirable to conduct this important discussion in a tone, and with a temper, better adapted to the candid and conciliatory mode in which it was opened by the noble Earl; and in the little with which he proposed to trouble their Lordships, he should think it his duty to follow the advice which the noble Lord had given in the most vehement manner he ever remembered to have heard. All that had subsequently occurred, had only tended to confirm and strengthen his conviction, that no advantage could be derived from indulging in personal recriminations. He was peculiarly gratified in having an opportunity of rising after a noble Lord who had so decided an opinion, and had always been a most zealous and consistent supporter of Reform; for many of those noble Lords who had addressed the House earlier in the debate divided their efforts so equally between the two sides of the question, that one-half of their speeches furnished the best possible answer to the other. Among these speeches, he must take the liberty to include that of a noble Viscount, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who, addressing their Lordships with his usual ability, had given them an eloquent declamation in favour of the Bill, and a powerful argument against it. That noble Viscount had informed them, that he had always been a decided opponent of Parliamentary Reform; and even now, when he had been induced to support it, he would be no party to the public delusion, or feed the people with the hope that a better management of affairs would follow the adoption of this measure, because he did not himself entertain such an opinion. In this he differed entirely from the noble Lord who last addressed the House, for he imputed all our difficulties—our great expenditure and overwhelming debt, to the want of Parliamentary Reform. The noble Viscount, with that gallantry which he possessed, had declared that he would yield nothing to clamour, but that he gave way to the well-understood opinion of the people. That it might be the opinion of the people that the Bill should pass, he could comprehend, and, to a great extent, he believed it was so; but that the noble Viscount could assert that he would never yield to clamour, and yet propose to vote for the second reading, perfectly surprised him. The Lord Privy Seal had contended, that this desire for Reform was not new, but was of old date. He admitted that it was an old feeling resuscitated; but when the noble Lord asked them, whether they ever remembered a time when the people thought otherwise, he must answer, that he was unfortunately an older man than the noble Lord, and he could well remember a period—and that in the midst of war and profuse expenditure—when, if such language as the noble Lord and the friends of the Bill had uttered in this debate, had been used at any public meeting, the speaker would have been exposed to the same insult and outrage which the opponents of Reform had recently experienced. He had always observed that, when, from whatever cause, the people were distressed, they always imputed their sufferings to the misconduct of the Government; and, for the truth of this remark, he appealed, as the noble Lord had done, to the history of all times. He, indeed, ascribed the wars in which this country had been engaged, and the vast debt which had followed, to the want of a Reformed Parliament; but had he informed their Lordships in what wars, and what losses the nations around had been involved during the same period? Would the noble Baron charge the enormous ambition of Buonaparte, and the immense machine which he wielded, till he laid half the world at his feet, to the corruption of the House of Commons? And had the noble Baron forgotten that it was this rejected Constitution which enabled this kingdom, small in extent, but vast in its resources, to triumph over that colossal antagonist, and raise itself to such high pre-eminence? The noble Lord was loud in his complaints of the extravagance of the present House of Commons, but had he ever taken the trouble to look into the sums which the patriots in the Long Parliament lavished on themselves and their adherents, in spite of all their self-denying ordinances?—Had he examined into the expenditure of the present reformed government of France, made after the three glorious days of July? He would then find enough to make him doubt whether reformed governments would be more faithful guardians of the public purse than our unreformed Parliament, which had carried retrenchment so far as to leave it doubtful whether it had not lowered the military force, and the strength of the Government, beyond what was consistent with the interests, perhaps even the safety, of the country. The noble Baron had expatiated on what would have been the fortunate results had Charles 1st and Louis 16th made earlier concessions to the wishes of the people—these points he would not discuss with him, because it was absolutely impossible for the wit of man, or the penetration of philosophy, to discover what might have been the consequence of a different conduct from any which was pursued in times of such great and complicated difficulty. The noble Lord had dwelt upon the danger of withholding timely concessions; but were there not dangers on both sides? And did not history afford abundant lessons on the fatal consequence of concession, and the advantage of firm, but well-advised resistance? Taking leave of this part of the subject, he would not follow the noble Lord into details which it was natural for him to enter into, but which, when opposing the principle of the Bill, were not necessary for him to discuss. If, contrary to his hope and expectation, the Bill should be committed, he would not enter into minute cavils with a view to harass or embarrass the Government, but endeavour to give to the details of the Bill what amendments they might be capable of; and without pledging himself to his ultimate vote on the third reading, he would meet it as he had hitherto done, with a fair, manly, and open opposition upon public principle alone. Their Lordships had often been reminded of the dangers arising to Government from an obstinate adherence to old practices under altered circumstances; but might he not be permitted to ask whether in this, which some thought violent and revolutionary, but which, at least, was a very strong and extensive measure, there might not be, on the part of its authors, some remaining bias or partiality to old opinions, some faint reminiscences of the old Whig club of toast-drinking memory? Might it not have received a little colouring from the tone and temper of the speeches of every Whig underling at every public meeting during the last forty years? And something from the spirit, freshly reimported, of the numerous constitution-mongers who had been so busily employed on the Continent during the same period, without ever having succeeded in making one permanent constitution? Or if there might be one, or perhaps two, which yet lingered in existence, they were but new-born, ricketty bantlings, already perishing in their cradles of infantine decrepitude. He could not content himself with his noble friend (Lord Haddington) to search for a plank from the wreck, on which to float a little while longer; but he hoped that by strenuous exertions, they might extricate the vessel from the shoal, and preserve her uninjured by the storm. Before he consented to go into a Committee on this Bill, he must be satisfied that there was a fair prospect that it might be so amended, as to produce a Representation capable of affording better protection to all the great interests of the country. He therefore was justified in asking them whether, in this Bill, the political, the commercial, the colonial interests had been wisely provided for? But he should content himself with asking, whether they had made any just or fit provision for the colonial interests? The noble Lord, he believed, who had first proposed the Amendment, had put that question, and had asked them whether the want of such a provision was not a strong objection to the Bill? And he had been answered with another question by a noble Lord opposite, who asked why they would concede to the colonial interest, and refuse to the home interest? He thought that his noble friend had not been fairly dealt with by that sort of answer, for his argument was, that the colonies were now virtually represented by means of the boroughs, but that, in conceding to the home interest, those boroughs would be taken away, so that the advantage which the colonists now virtually possessed would be destroyed, and nothing would be substituted in its stead. It was said, that this measure was one deeply affecting the interest of the poorer classes; he thought that it quite as deeply affected the richer. He always believed that it was the object of all governments to secure the interests of property. He thought that the Government had not, in the present measure, attended to that object. It was said, that the rich man could, if he disliked to stay in a country, sell his lands and go away; but that the poor man, however wretched he might be, was fixed to the soil. How the first part of that statement could be made he did not understand. How it could be said that a rich man might sell his lands, when there were no purchasers at all to be found in the market, he was at a loss to conceive. He believed that whenever this revolution should be carried, if it ever was carried, into effect, the unfortunate landholder would be found incapable of getting anything for his lands, but if he quitted the country he must take his poverty with him. He thought that old institutions were to be preserved under this Bill—at least, it was so said. Yet he did not see that the basis of property was attended to, or that any beneficial result flowed from this alleged care of property. On the contrary, he asserted, that democratic influence was most attended to, for that power was given in the great towns to the lowest of the inhabitants, and the Constitution was, in fact, made more democratic than ever. At one time the noble Earl himself admitted the opposition of interest in the counties and great towns, for he proposed to give fifty-five new Members to counties, and only forty-three to the towns. It was not for him to argue that in that proposition the noble Earl was wrong, for that towns and counties had a common interest—he believed that in fact they had a common interest in the general prosperity, though they might differ as to the means by which that prosperity was to be attained. In the last Bill ten new Members had been given to counties, ten to great towns, and forty to smaller boroughs; and it was said that when new Members were given to great towns, it was necessary likewise to give them to counties. There was the admission of actual necessity from the noble Earl; and yet, in the present Bill, which he (Lord C.) had before stated, and truly stated, to be more democratic than the former, that principle was not applied. Twelve Members were given to the large towns, and ten to the smaller boroughs; and to the counties, on the strength of the noble Earl's declaration were given, what?—Nothing. It was true that the noble Earl had given in this Bill one additional Member to a county; but then he immediately afterwards took away the Member to give it to a large town that had before been forgotten. The boon was no sooner given than it was taken away. The gentlemen of the county of Monmouth would understand how impartially the authors of the Bill had looked upon the common and undistinguishable interests of the country. But if he could obviate all other objections to the measure there was one which it was impossible to obviate, an objection which went entirely to the principle of the Bill, which was of the deepest importance, which must sensibly affect every sincere friend of the established religion of the country, and which lay at the foundation of the Protestant interest. He earnestly called upon their Lordships' attention to the tremendous extent of the present measure in connexion with the present state of Ireland. He entreated them to consider the character of the Irish Reform Bill, which was not indeed then before them, but which they knew to be in progress. There was not one of their Lordships but must be convinced that it was impossible for them to pass this Bill and refuse to pass that. The advocates of the measure said not only that the opinion of the country required Reform, but that great and important interests had sprung up since the present Constitution of Parliament had been established, for which adequate Representation ought to be provided. Now, the interests which had grown up were precisely the interests for which the Bill did not provide. They were interests for which our forefathers had not provided, because in their day, they were not in existence. Had they been in existence it could not be doubted that our forefathers would have provided for them an adequate share of the Representation. The Bill threw overboard the funded and colonial interests of England, and what did it do for Ireland? Unfortunately that country had no monied or colonial interest to provide for. What was really wanted was not a Representation of new towns, but of new interests. And had this been the main feature or principle of the Bill it might have been a ground for going into Committee. But the authors of the Bill took the same general scope for the three kingdoms, regardless of the difference of their circumstances and position. The principle of enfranchising large towns which had been laid down was not applicable to Ireland, for there, unfortunately, a manufacturing interest had not grown up. She had no manufacturing towns, nor was it possible in Ireland to find the materials of manufacturing a schedule A. And was this the moment, when that country was in a state of turbulence approaching to the character of a servile war, and when the property of the Church had already become the subject of spoliation—was this the moment to increase the agitation of society by throwing into its bosom the discussion of the principles of Parliamentary Reform? Was this the time to introduce a measure of Reform which must add strength to the party who had already despoiled the Church, after having declared at the period of their emancipation that by that measure they would be fully and permanently satisfied? Was the state of society in Ireland such at the present moment as to encourage them to introduce a measure of Reform which must deprive of political power and influence the friends, the only friends, of British connection, and give a predominant power to those who had made so bad a use of what they now enjoyed, and who actually threatened, in express terms to employ the power they were about to acquire for the subversion of the British Government? This argument did apply to the principle of the present Bill. He had hoped that the state of Ireland would have opened the eyes of his Majesty's Government to the question of Reform. They had received a little information from a friend of their own, (Mr. Shiel) one of the most influential men in Ireland. Did he prophecy a long period of calm, and happiness, and prosperity, as a consequence of this measure? A venerable statesman had predicted all these as the consequences of Catholic Emancipation. But, alas! the laurels were already torn from his brow. This friend of Ministers spoke fearlessly and forcibly to the purpose. He told the noble Earl that the giant democracy which that Bill would call into being would drive him to the verge of a precipice, would hang him suspended over it, and would there shake him till he conceded its utmost wishes. If this Gentleman, and others of the same school desired that this measure should produce the fruits which his noble friends expected, would they now, in the present stage of the Bill, gratify themselves by indulging in this bragging style of Irish oratory? He could imagine a caricature which it would, indeed, be lamentable to see realized in fact. The noble Earl should be held in a grasp of this democratic giant, over a fearful precipice, dressed in all the gorgeous robes and decorations of his order, and in the magnificent folds of these robes should be seen a Representation of all vested interests, the property of the Church, the funds, the colonies; and having been shaken until life was extinct, down they should fall. One circumstance in this caricature he should especially not forget. It should have the letters H. B. in the corner. Had their Lordships the slightest hope that the measure would be productive of tranquillity in Ireland? His Majesty's Ministers had said that they had selected the place at which they were prepared to make their stand. Did any of them think now that they could do so? If they did, he would ask them what they would think of what one of their own body had been heard to say—and sometimes one did hear what men filling the high situation of Ministers said out of Parliament—what would they think had one of their own body said that the present measure could not be final, but that it was going as far as they thought it prudent to go for the present? If this was the language of Ministers of the Crown, how could they expect that that House would follow them to the extent which they now provisionally proposed, and adopt a measure which they recommended to them as final, and which was identified with another measure yet to be introduced? What did they see at the present moment so propitious to their attempt that they selected it for the purpose of rooting up the established institutions of the country and of planting others in their stead. A philosophic statesman and orator, Mr. Burke, who had been previously quoted by the noble Baron who spoke last observed, 'As it is the interest of Government that 'reformation should be early, it is the interest of the people it should be temperate. It is their interest, because a temperate Reform is permanent, and because 'it has a principle of growth. Whenever 'we improve, it is right to leave room for a 'further improvement; it is right to consider, to look about us, to examine the effect 'of what we have done. Then we can proceed with confidence, because we can 'proceed with intelligence;—whereas, in 'hot reformations—in what men, more 'zealous than considerate, call making 'clear work—the whole generally is so 'crude, so harsh, so indigested, mixed 'with so much imprudence and so much 'injustice, so contrary to the whole course 'of human nature and human institutions, 'that the very people who are most eager 'for it, are among the first to grow disgusted with what they have done.' It would be wise, before their Lordships came to a decision on this hasty and intemperate project, to weigh well the words of that eminent statesman. His noble friend (the Marquis of Lansdown) had referred to the constitution of America. It had not been customary hitherto, in this country to appeal to American precedents; but if this Bill was to pass, it would be wise in those who hoped to govern the country hereafter, to accustom themselves to such constitutional references. Yet it would have been as well if his noble friend had turned over another leaf of the American constitution, and there learned how well that people knew, and how cautiously they guarded against, the changeful spirit of republican legislatures. In the fifth Act of the original constitution of the States, which he believed was yet unrepealed, the noble Marquis would find. 'The Congress whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem 'it necesssary, shall propose amendments 'to this constitution, or on the application 'of the legislatures of two-thirds of the 'several States shall call a Convention for 'proposing amendments, which in either 'case shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the constitution when 'ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the 'one or the other mode of ratification 'may be proposed by the Congress. 'Provided that no amendment, which 'may be made prior to the year 1808, 'shall in any manner affect the first and 'fourth clauses in the 9th section of 'the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its 'equal suffrage in the senate.' That was more like a contrast than a parallel to the precipitation with which the present Government of England had proceeded in the work of Reform—a precipitate haste which excluded the time for deliberation, and was regardless even of the health of Members of Parliament—a degree of haste, in relation to this particular measure, so pressing and urgent that it placed all the great and complicated business of the country in a state of abeyance and neglect. Even the usual period of relaxation after the labours of an oppressive Session had been abridged. During that period of relaxation he read in a Journal, with which he was happy to hear to-night that his Majesty's Government was not in communication, that Parliament was to assemble before Christmas. He began of course immediately to prepare for his journey to town, although he had learned that the meeting of Parliament was not to be until after the holidays. The noble Marquis had applied to a right reverend Prelate the appellation of a recruiting officer against the Bill. Were there no recruiting officers in its favour? Were there none who, having on a former occasion voted against it themselves, had now employed all their powers of persuasion to induce other Peers to Act as they did, and vote in its support? He did not blame this conduct. He knew it was natural that men in society should endeavour to impress upon others the motives which at the moment they might happen to entertain, however these motives might vary from hour to hour. But the charge of being a recruiting officer against the Bill was a strange one, when that Bill professedly had no other foundation than popular opinion. He had been a Member of Parliament for many years, and he never knew the time when Ministers were not desirous of making parliamentary proselytes. It was also said, that the object of this Bill was to give the middle classes a greater share in the Representation. If it were so, it should have his support; for he thought the middle classes of this country were the most loyal, the most wealthy, the most intelligent middle class in the world. If he could believe the Bill would give an increase of influence and power in Parliament, to that body he should be most unwilling to oppose it. He knew no safer or better depositaries of authority than they could be, holding, as they did, a great portion of the landed, and nearly all of the mercantile, wealth of the kingdom. But was it, he asked, by a measure like this that the middle classes were to receive a share in the Government? How many of the middle classes, ordinarily lived in houses of 10*l*. a-year? Not one of them occupied such premises except some thrifty old bachelor, with a view to save his rent, but it was not for such a class of men that they were to legislate. The only difference of persons which could be established in this country was, between those who lived upon their capital or on the produce of their property, or by the exercise of their talents, which might be accounted capital, and those who lived merely upon the fruits of their daily manual or mechanical labour. It was with a view to the interests of both these classes that the theory of Representation was founded. Now, in his opinion, this Bill would be fatal to the middle classes. The middle classes would, in his opinion, be entirely swamped by this measure. He trusted, however, that ere long—he hoped it would not be too late—they would discover their true rights, and see that their interests were identical with those of that class which had been denominated the highest. True it was, the greatest properties might be the first seized, but the properties of all of the middle classes would eventually become the prey of the spoiler. They might expect great things from this measure of Reform, but, if it passed they would derive nothing from it but their own destruction. The noble Earl (Earl Grey) said, you must not judge of the Reform Bill by the Returns in November next. Hereafter, he said, the country would be satisfied—property would recover its natural ascendancy—people of a different kind would be elected. He supposed the noble Earl meant good Members would be then returned, because he said he wished for a change in a part of the Constitution, because it was incapable of returning good Members. Now the noble Earl had long been a Member for Northumberland—he ceased to represent that county—he became then a Member for a close borough. But did he then cease to become a good Member of Parliament? Did Mr. Fox cease to be a good Member of Parliament when he became the Representative of a close borough? When—as it assuredly would be if the Bill passed—Ireland was separated from England, and all the Protestant establishments in that country put down, he was compelled to say, that, under all the circumstances, the House of Brunswick could not be regarded in Ireland as other than usurpers. What, then, he asked, would become of the Bill of Rights? The leaders of a certain party in Ireland declared that, when their first summer should have passed away, and the Autumn of our decay should produce the yellow leaf, the next Autumn would see the whole fabric in the dust. He, however, did look to what would take place hereafter; and he said, that, if the Bill passed in anything like the shape it was presented to them, the sooner they turned away their eyes from Ireland the better. The noble Lord had compared the Constitution to a coat; for himself, he was satisfied that they should wear that old Saxon garment so long as a shred of it remained. The noble Lord was a greater dandy; but he would not consent to have the pro- [illegible] f the Constitution placed in durance to gratify the fancies of a political tailor, although he might bring over to us the newest French [illegible] hions, and recommend to our notice the Belgian costume. He had heard much of the march of intellect, and he thought the march of folly had been parallel with the march of intellect; so much so, indeed, that it required great discrimination to distinguish the footsteps of the one from the traces of the other. Therefore, he considered that they should be most cautious in coming to a decision of this question of Reform. The Ministry, in their attempt to redeem a rash pledge, did not alone risk their own honour and character, but they risked the property and happiness of all men in the country, and they risked the greatness and glory of the empire. If the noble Earl could play the part of Quintus Curtius, they would have no right to object to it; but they certainly had a right to object to his compromising the happiness and safety of others. The noble Earl, however, did not seem to admire that act of self-devotion, for he would rather swamp the honour and independence of that House than run the smallest risk even of deranging his own consistency. The noble Earl had said, he did not wish to be driven to the expedient of creating Peers, which, if possible, he would fain not use. What was the necessity which compelled him to sacrifice the House of Lords? How was he driven to it? Was it to carry the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill? It could only be for this. Since, without much driving, all, or almost all, acknowledged that, under present circumstances, it would be wise to concede some temperate Reform. And was it merely to carry into effect a scheme which was so temperate, that it only left two Universities, which they did not much like, untouched and unaltered, that the noble Earl would destroy the House of Peers? Was it to force upon them his exclusive Bill, that he was prepared to say to them, "If I have no other means, I will not hesitate to destroy the House of Lords?" Was it for such an object he was prepared to advise the Sovereign to set his hand to an Act, which was an abuse of his authority —an abuse of his most important prerogative. Was it for this he would recommend the Sovereign to an act which had been pronounced, by the greatest lawyers of the age, a greater violation of the duty of the Sovereign to the other branches of the Legislature than any which had been committed by James 2nd? Could they forget that, by a vote of Parliament—and who would say that it was an improper vote?—James 2nd was declared to have abdicated the Throne of these realms? He knew the noble Earl had always been a Reformer; but the noble Viscount had not long been a Reformer, and many of the present Government had been brought up in the school of the Anti-Jacobins. He knew that his noble friend had not made up his mind to a Reform until after a painful struggle. He knew that it was said, his noble friend, if a Reformer at all, was a most moderate Reformer. Well, then, with a Government, consisting in great part of such new converts to Reform—and the noble Earl having admitted that his ideas on the subject had been much changed—he could not suppose that Government would take a step so fraught with danger. He admired the Whigs of former times, who felt the danger of meddling with our institutions, and pursued a very different line from the Whiglings of the present day. What could they think, when they heard Law Officers of the Crown not only maintain that the King had a right, by making Peers, to destroy the House of Lords, but also that he had a right to issue writs to some towns and places, and withhold them from others—in fact, that he possessed the uncontrolled powers of the Grand Seignor, and could make two new Houses of Parliament out of his own slaves and dependents? This was the modern Whig version of the British Constitution. They recommend for imitation one of the worst acts of the Tories—one of the worst measures that soil the pages of our history—and one for which the guilty Minister was impeached by the Whig Opposition of that day. The love of things ancient, he knew it was the fashion of the day to decry as debasing prejudice. For his part, he thought it a sentiment which elevated the character of him who entertained it. What but this prejudice made a man prefer the friend of his youth to a stranger unknown to him?—and what also was it that bound the noblest spirits to their own country? What but that made them prefer the oaks of the forest, under which the Druids might have worshipped, to the splendid foliage of the spring. He would conclude by imploring their Lordships to remember, that the British Constitution was one of those ancient and venerable objects; and to reject the pernicious counsels which had been addressed to them in behalf of the Bill, and thus save their country from the many evils by which it was threatened. He implored their Lordships not to lay the axe to the root of the tree. He implored them to avert the axe. If they did so, their destiny was in their own power: if not, their destruction appeared to him inevitable.

Viscount *Goderich* said, he had listened with the utmost attention to the eloquent speech of the noble Earl; but still the noble Earl had not succeeded in convincing him that the objections which he had urged with so much force against the principles of this Bill were founded on solid reasoning, or were supported by conclusive argument. One thing was quite apparent on the present occasion—it gave a novel air to their proceedings, and, as it was well worthy of their Lordships' notice, he thought it right to advert to it. If their Lordships' former discussions of this subject did not prove that a general wish for some degree of Reform existed, it was now perfectly clear, from the concessions made by all, that, whether this Bill was or was not the proper measure—whether it did or did not embrace the right mode for correcting the defects in the Representative system—still the general opinion evidently was, that some material change must take place in that system. He stated this in justification of the course which he had adopted with reference to this question. If he wanted to vindicate himself against the charge which the noble Earl seemed half-disposed to bring against some Members of his Majesty's Government, who now pursued a course different from that which they had taken in former periods of their life, he thought he might appeal with confidence, as the ground of his justification, to that consentaneous opinion which all had expressed as to the necessity of adopting some species of Reform. What that Reform ought to be was now the subject of debate. He quarrelled not with those who fairly stated their objections to the measure now under consideration. It was fit that they should consider the plan submitted to them for their approbation. It was right that they should investigate whether the plan now brought before the House was the best that could be devised for the purpose which his Majesty's Government had in view. Amongst those who were compelled to make the admission that some Reform was necessary, there appeared however, to be a sort of intuitive horror against any effectual Reform—an intuitive horror against the extinction of that which was at the bottom of all the evil, and the attempt to get rid of which formed the head and front of the offending of his Majesty's Ministers. He meant the extinction of the nomination boroughs. The arguments of the noble Lord who moved the amendment, and of a noble friend of his who spoke ably on the subject the other night, all proceeded on the principle that these nomination boroughs were extremely useful. The noble Baron (Ellenborough) had paraded before their Lordships a list of many distinguished individuals who had found their way into Parliament, and some of whom now sat there by virtue of this very abuse. The noble Baron had told their Lordships of the utility of the presence of those Members in Parliament, and he argued that the honour of their character, and the value of their services, were sufficient to vindicate the defective mode by which they got into Parliament. The noble Baron painted with great warmth the more agreeable parts of the system, but he left untouched those darker shades by which it was disfigured. Noble Lords might conceal those defects from themselves, but they could not conceal them from the eyes of the country. The noble Baron, in addressing their Lordships, had not defended what had been called the shameful parts of the Constitution; but that noble Baron was followed by a bolder champion—a member of the Church—he might almost say of the church militant. That right rev. Prelate, with a boldness that filled his mind with astonishment, defended that system—the defects of which the noble Baron had attempted to conceal, and loudly called on their Lordships to perpetuate its most glaring abuse. The arguments of the right rev. Prelate were the most dangerous he had ever heard. Why, he asked, were those defects called the shameful parts of the Constitution? They were shameful, in the first place, because they were inconsistent with the Constitution—they were shameful, because they were not agreeable to any intelligible idea of Representation—they were shameful, because they placed in the hands of irresponsible individuals an influence which they ought not to possess—they were shameful, because the Members were irresponsible, because it was impossible to have any guarantee against the liability of that power being subject to that which all such power must be more or less subject to—gross abuse—in fine, they were emphatically shameful, because it was well known that they were abused. The right of nomination, it was contended, might be safely exercised; but their Lordships must be aware that that right frequently changed hands, and they must also be aware that those who wished to procure it were compelled to pay for it. What, then, were they to expect from those who made a sacrifice of property to obtain an interest of this kind? Looking to human nature, they could only expect that individuals who gave money for boroughs would endeavour to make money out of them, and would rather attend to their own views of interest or of ambition than to the public good. And yet they were gravely told that this great right, this power of nomination, ought to be preserved as the best feature of the Constitution, without which their Lordships, and all their honours, must tumble to the earth and be ground to powder, for such was the phrase used by the right rev. Prelate. Their Lordships, however, must all well know that that so much boasted right was contaminated by money; and he would contend that it was a stain, a shame, a blot, to the Representation of this country. He would contend that it was contrary to individual rights—that it was contrary to freedom of election—that it was contrary to law—that it was contrary to ancient usage—that it was contrary to the well-considered Constitution of the country. Did he make these observations from any private feelings of his own, unsupported by authority? Did he extract these words from ancient musty records, over which the antiquary loved to pore? Did he go to philosophers of old for the sentiment which he had expressed? Did he apply to the Constitution-mongers of France or of any other country to bear him out in his opinions? No; he quoted words from an authority that must satisfy their Lordships. He quoted the words of an authority which, give him leave to say, their Lordships durst not dispute. He gave them the words of an Act of Parliament; and perhaps it would be well for their Lordships to consider how the law dealt with the improper intermeddling with the Representation. The law described this offence, which was an invariable adjunct, a component part of the system of nomination—for he defied any noble Lord to dissociate the offence from what was called the right of nomination—the law, then, first described the offence, and then proceeded to lay down the punishment. It declared, that the individual who paid the money, which was to place him in the House, should be subjected to a penalty of 1,000*l.* It declared him incapable of sitting in Parliament for that place or any other, and, in short, pointed him out, *ipso facto*, as no Member of Parliament. If any individual who had incurred this penalty became, for the first time, cognizant of the fact, ought it not to give him strong ground for reflection, when he found that such serious consequences might arise from his conduct in putting individuals into Parliament who had no right to be there? This system, he would argue, tended to destroy all respect for law—it tended to confound all notion of right and wrong—it tended to involve in inextricable difficulty the limits of obedience and disobedience. Let their Lordships consider how large a portion of our laws rested, not merely on moral sense, but on positive enactment—how large a portion of offences, like those which he had been describing, were *mala prohibita*. If the corrupt system at present pursued were allowed to go on with impunity, what effect would it have on our Legislation with respect to other offences? He agreed with the right rev. Prelate in considering this the most august assembly in the world, but he did not see that it was likely to be supported in its lofty state by the admission of the doctrine which the right rev. Prelate had laid down. If they admitted a system of this kind, on what point, he would ask, were they to rest the affections of the people of this country, when they were so governed? When he was told that this system ought to be maintained for the security of their Lordships' dignity, independence, and station in the country, he felt that he was called upon to forget all those lofty feelings and considerations which gave value and distinction to an English Peerage:—

> "Incipit ipsorum contra me stare Parentum
> Nobilitas claramque facem præferre pudori."

When it was argued that the Ministers were revolutionists, because they wished to cut off from the Constitution those abuses, and that the amputation of these shameful excrescences was to lead to inevitable ruin, he wanted to know what would be the ultimate effect of perpetuating the gangrene of such a sore, and how long they might hope to linger on under the influence of such an undermining and fatal malady? Looking at the posture in which the country stood, and the feeling which led the people to call for an additional measure of Reform, it was impossible for the Legislature to escape without making some decided attempt to get rid of this monstrous abuse, which every man knew to exist, and few were disposed to bear. If the disfranchisement of some boroughs was necessary, in order to give enfranchisement to others of more importance, he believed he should find no one who would contest the justice of that principle. Indeed, the noble Lord who spoke last, had formerly admitted the propriety of some such change. He had even taken steps to obtain it, and when he blamed Ministers for having proposed such a measure as the present, he wondered that that noble Earl had not reflected on the want of success which he had himself experienced in winning over their Lordships to a minor and more moderate Reform. That noble Lord had quoted a beautiful sentiment of Mr. Burke, which he entirely adopted; but, so far from justifying the noble Earl's argument, it did, in his eyes, afford a direct vindication of his conduct. The substance of that passage was an exhortation "to grant a change in time—not to suffer ourselves to be driven into a corner —to apply temperate remedies to prevent those consequences in which the want of such remedies had in all times, and in all countries, involved all governments." They had heard much of revolution, and a right rev. Prelate the other night had given them what appeared to him to be the most singular history of the revolution of France that he had ever heard. The right rev. Prelate seemed to think that the excesses which were committed in the early part of the revolution were sanctioned by the law. He said, "I will show you that great changes were effected in France, and that dreadful excesses were committed under the sanction of the law which those changes had produced." Now, he should like to know by virtue of what law, or by virtue of what part of the French constitution it was that the mob of Paris stormed the Bastile. He would ask the right rev. Prelate, by virtue of what law of France it was, that a furious crowd of beings, more like demons than human creatures, thirsting for blood, proceeded to Versailles, burst in upon the privacy of the Chamber of the King and Queen, murdered their guards, and conveyed them to Paris, preceded, not by the ensigns of royalty, but by two frightful symbols of murder. Was that, he demanded, done under the sanction of any law? It was perfectly true that all these horrors occurred when great changes were taking place in France. It was also true that there existed at the time a sort of Representative body; but it was totally unlike—nay, it was the very antipodes of—any legislative authority that had ever existed in France. There had been a Chamber of Peers—there had been *tiers états*—but these horrors took place when those bodies no longer existed, and a forcible revolution had taken place. Was there, then, anything in the extinction of the nomination boroughs, which was at all similar to what had taken place in France? Certainly there was not; and he would say, not only was the extinction of those boroughs consistent with, but it was required by, the constitution. The extension of the elective franchise to large towns was justified by every principle of constitutional law. If, then, it were found necessary to give Members to places which did not at present possess Representatives in Parliament, how could they fairly regulate the principle if they did not apply it to individuals who inhabited large towns? What was the principle of scot-and-lot? What was the principle of the inhabitants of houses who were allowed to vote? How many individuals possessed the right of Representation founded upon these two points alone? Were Ministers, then, to be told by noble Lords opposite, that their proposition was speculative and fanciful? In point of fact, they adopted in the new boroughs which they proposed to create, the very same principle that had hitherto existed in most of the old boroughs in the kingdom. Then, he said, that it was utterly inconsistent with common sense and common reason to charge this measure with being revolutionary. Their Lordships might say that it went too far, that it disfranchised too much, or enfranchised where there was no occasion for it—that the qualification which it proposed was too low; but he defied them to give any proof of intelligent argument that any one of its principles comprehended an atom of what was inconsistent with the principle, law, and practice of the Constitution. It had been said, that, if the franchise were extended to the degree proposed, the measure would be of too democratic a nature. Much as he loved liberty—and he loved it not only because a love of it had descended to him from those, some of them not insignificant, from whom he derived his birth; but he loved it because he thought it necessary for the happiness and the well-being of his country—but he did not think it necessary for liberty that democratic principles should prevail to too great an extent. But he wished to know how the franchise which Ministers proposed was so democratic as it had been called? They proposed to give an additional right and power to the middle classes of society to send Members to Parliament. But when noble Lords argued against that principle of the measure, they always spoke as if the 10*l.* qualification was the maximum, and not the minimum. They talked of the qualification as if there lived in great towns no persons but those who just came within that description. But, when they came to discuss the Bill in detail, he believed it would be perfectly easy to show that there never existed a greater delusion. Yet he wished to know on what principle the franchise could be given to persons who moved in an honest and respectable, but still somewhat inferior rank of life, if it were not generally extended to such a degree, at least, as to bring them within the qualification required? Some of the persons who would vote under the qualification proposed were wealthy—some were highly educated—some had great influence and power. They would have the right of voting by virtue of the franchise, as regulated by the Bill. Others, perhaps, less influential—less wealthy—of inferior education, less cultivated and refined—came also within the 10*l.* qualification. But why should they be excluded from the right of voting? And if there should happen to be an inferior and lower class of persons, with nothing but their industry to recommend them, on what account were they to be excluded? Did it follow that a man must necessarily be excluded from the right of voting for Representatives in Parliament, merely because he did not happen to be rich or accomplished? According to the provisions of this Bill, the lowest of those whom it was proposed to invest with the privilege of voting for Members to serve in the other House might be assumed to be honest and industrious persons. They might not be great politicians—not men whom one would take into Council to decide upon great political acts—not persons to whom one would intrust the reins of Government; but they were men from the earnings of whose industry the condition was exacted that they should be charged to the poor-rate to a certain amount—that that charge should be paid—that the amount of the assessment to the King's taxes should be paid—that they should have occupied the house in which they lived for a certain term; and that, fulfilling these conditions, they should be admitted to the right of voting for Representatives in Parliament. He maintained that there was the strongest presumption for believing that a man, who had fulfilled these conditions was, at least, honest and industrious. If he were idle and profligate it was impossible, or at all events, extremely improbable, that he could comply with such conditions. And why, he wished to know, should their Lordships suppose that all people of this description were a set of levellers? He believed that there was a body of persons in this as well as in other countries, who were anxious for a war of no property against property; but if their Lordships adopted this Bill, and showed that they had confidence in that class out of which the ranks of the discontented were likely to be strengthened, they would take the best method of binding them by a new tie to those whom fortune had placed above them; and he had no doubt that they would send to the House of Commons men fit to represent them, and who would be capable of performing their duties properly. In the visionary fears, then, of those noble Lords who anticipated so many unhappy results from the proposed enlargement of the franchise, he, for one, could not participate. He must, in conclusion, beg to allude to the speech of the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Exeter) on a former night. That right rev. Prelate had invoked the great Ruler and Disposer of things to direct them in their decision on this eventful occasion. In that prayer he joined, although he could not help contrasting the last words of the right rev. Prelate with the tone and temper which pervaded his speech. He (Lord Goderich) did not wish to offend or to hurt the feelings of any man; but upon this occasion, and upon some others that had occurred, things had been said with respect to the motives, perhaps, but certainly with respect to the conduct of the Government on matters of a sacred character, which had created in his mind feelings which he knew hardly how to check. They had been accused of indifference to religion, and of unchristian conduct. He regretted that such charges should have come from a quarter where he should have thought that a feeling of Christian charity would have intervened to prevent the utterance of that which, though embued with enough of gall and acrimony, was still without the slightest foundation.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, that during the fifty years of his public life he had never suffered such deep pain as on seeing the House of Commons come to the Bar of that House with the Bill now upon their Lordships' Table. Looking at that body as representing the constituency of the country, the light in which all great constitutional authorities held that they ought to be viewed, he could not but feel a deep sense of humiliation in recollecting the pledges under which they had permitted themselves to be returned to the House of Commons. At the time of the Revolution of 1688, when the convention came to pass an Act of Parliament by which the best rights of the subject were secured, they set out by a declaration of this doctrine, affirming that they were not delegates from this place or from that place, but, clothing themselves with a character more elevated and a higher duty, they declared that they were the Representatives of all the Commons of England. To convert a Member of the other House of Parliament into the mere Representative of the particular place for which he was returned, instead of the Representative of the whole of the Commons of England, was a perversion of one of the best principles of the Constitution; and if there were Members of the other House who would indeed submit to the degradation of being called to account by their particular constituents, it was high time to take measures to prevent such men from continuing to sit in Parliament. It had been stated, that he (the Earl of Eldon) had declared himself in that House an enemy to all Reform. He begged to repeat what he had stated upon a late occasion in that House, that he was bound as a Peer of Parliament to pledge himself not at all; but in the conscientious discharge of his duty to consider and determine upon each measure separately according to its merits. He opposed the measure in discharge of a sacred duty which he owed to the Constitution and to the people. Long as he had been in Parliament, he never yet heard any proposition for Reform in either House which in his conscience he believed was more or less than a mere alteration, without any improvement being likely to result from it; nor was any one alteration ever proposed which it was possible for him to support. It was alleged as one of the necessities for Reform, that the Members of that House and of the House of Commons had no care for any men but those of their own rank. On the contrary, his principle was, that members of Parliament, whether sitting in that House or in the House of Commons, were the trustees of the people, and bound to act the best for their interests. If a man was poor and in a humble station of life, he was an Englishman and their fellow-countryman, and as well entitled to protection and to have his happiness consulted as their Lordships themselves. But then he was told, that, for the last fifty years, he had voted against all Reform; and although he had heard many propositions on that subject which he would more readily have voted for than for this, that assertion was true. But having admitted that, he must do himself the justice to say, that he never saw the proposition made which, in his conscience, he believed had a tendency to promote the happiness, or advance the prosperity of the country. He never had seen, in that or in the other House, any measure, though coming under the enchanting name of Reform, which appeared to him calculated to lead in any likelihood to an alteration for the better. But would any man to whom he had now the honour of addressing himself tell him, that this Bill did not contemplate a more violent and extensive change than had ever before been proposed by any man possessing the character of a statesman? Let them take the plans of Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, and of the noble Earl himself, and compare them with what was now before their Lordships. Yet there never was a measure proposed in the House of Commons while he was there, which the House did not think dangerous, and rejected it accordingly. But then he was asked, why they did not go into the Committee and try to improve it? His answer was, "You have brought in a Bill so vicious in its principles, that it is impossible to correct them in dealing with the clauses in Committee." The noble Earl had told them, one and all, that the principles of the Bill were to be found in the preamble. What he had to say upon that point was this: that if the principles of this Bill were to be found in the preamble, then the principles of the last Bill must have been contained in the preamble also, which was a very unfortunate fact for his noble friend, who opposed the last Bill because its principles were incorrigible, and yet voted for this on account of some change which they saw in its principles; for he would undertake to say, that, in the preamble now before them, there was no syllable, no word, no letter, of alteration from the preamble of the last Bill. How, then, did it happen, that those noble Lords were now ready to go into Committee with a view to amend the clauses, when they were before unanimous in determining, and in leading the House to determine, that they would not go into Committee, because the principles contained in the preamble were so vicious, that it was impossible their vices could be cured? But those noble Lords now turned round and said, that there had been some change in the principle. He denied that there was in reality any change. But then they were told, that the Bill, such as it was, had come recommended to them by the opinions of the wealth and intelligence of the country. He denied the assertion; but, though many in the country might have expressed an opinion favourable to this measure, he did not think that opinion would remain the same, if they had the Bills affecting the other parts of the United Kingdom fully before them. When the Bill was brought into their Lordships' House, it was his intention to have moved its postponement, until the whole extent of the measure was before them. But the minds of the people were so bent upon the settlement of the question, that he scarcely felt himself justified in interposing delay. He was now sorry, however, that he did not move the postponement of the consideration of this Bill, until the Irish and Scotch Bills were before them. The state of the question of the Church in Ireland, was such as to have caused great distrust in his mind, as to whether they ought to have given any consideration to this Bill, until something had been done to remove the danger with which it was threatened. His mind certainly did accuse him of not having done his duty to his fellow-subjects when he consented to receive the Bill. He did not mean to say, that all the three Bills should proceed *pari passu*, but, considering the nature of property in Scotland, and the situation of parties in Ireland, he thought their Lordships would look with somewhat different feelings at this Bill, if they had also the others before them. It was, however, now too late to express any regret on that point. Another consideration which he should wish to submit to their Lordships was this—and, perhaps, in submitting it, he should be told that he held, what he detested, radical doctrines. He would assert, that the House of Commons was elected by a constituency—that constituency now so much blamed and calumniated—yet all the laws, from the accession of William 3rd to the present time, were passed by Commons chosen by that constituency. Now, if that were to be set aside as unfit to choose a House of Commons, what, he would ask, would be the condition of the sovereignty of this country, and of all the great interests which had been affected by measures sanctioned by that House? If that constituency was now to be changed, what security were they to have for the continuance of those guarantees of person and property, on which they had hitherto relied with so much confidence? It might be of little consequence, perhaps, what became of him as an individual, or of what little property he had got together. His life and his property were both at the service of his country. His life was of little value at this time, and his property, perhaps, might be transferred to fructify in the pocket of some otherwise pennyless financier. These might be minor considerations in looking at the effect of a great change; but when he came to look at the possible and probable effect of that change on the sovereignty—on the throne of the country—he owned he could not contemplate it with any but feelings of fear and dismay. He was not one of those who could think, with any kind of satisfaction, on the effect of a system which might send the Sovereign of the country abroad, to provide for himself as a teacher of music or mathematics, and to afterwards import him back as a citizen king. He was the less inclined to look to the proposed measure with anything like a happy presage, when he considered that they were now debating it on its second and most important stage, on the very anniversary of the day which saw passed into a law another measure, of which so much good had been predicted, and from which so little had resulted; which, on the contrary, had produced effects the very reverse of those predicted by its supporters. He must repeat, then, that he looked with no confidence at the effect of allowing this measure to pass its present stage, for he saw no hope of such an amelioration of it in the Committee, as would cure what he considered the great defect of its principle. What argument could they expect to hear in the Committee, in favour of the most objectionable parts of the Bill, which they had not already heard? What would their Lordships say now, if they had allowed the last Bill to become the law of the land? Why the effect would have been, that they would have some towns disfranchised, which it was now intended should continue to return Members, and places excluded from the franchise, which were now included, yet the same kind of arguments were used for going into the Committee on that occasion as at present. They were then told, that it would be a final settlement of the question. It was a gross fallacy to state, that either that or the present Bill would be a final settlement of the question of Reform or change. What had they seen gained by any of the great changes which had been made within their time? They had seen the changes in France in the year 1789, followed by attempts at a revolution in this country; and how did they begin here? Why, placards were stuck up in all the public places, with the words "No King;" and he did not hesitate to predict that, if they passed the measure now before them, they would bring on such changes as would destroy that Constitution which had placed this country in an altitude so far above all other nations. But they would not stop even there—they would go on until, along with the ruin of the Constitution, they would also involve the ruin of the country itself. It was utterly impossible, that, if this Bill passed, it could be a final measure. He had heard much of a measure—the exercise of the royal prerogative—by which the passing of this Bill was to be secured. He did not deny the right of the Sovereign to the free exercise of that prerogative. He would admit that, at the next Recorder's report, of persons condemned at the Old Bailey, the Sovereign possessed, not only the right to grant a free pardon to any number of such convicts, but to make Peers of them if he pleased. At the same time he contended, that no censure would be too severe, no punishment too great, for any Minister who should advise his Sovereign to destroy the House of Lords, by such an enormous creation of new Peers. What caused the Revolution of 1688, which hurled James 2nd and the whole race of Stuarts from the Throne of this country? Was it not the power which he claimed of dispensing with the laws, and of setting his own will above the will of the two Houses of Parliament? Now, if the Crown were to exercise its power of creating Peers, to carry into execution an Act of Parliament, which that House deemed unfit to be carried into execution, would it not be a stretch of the prerogative in legislation quite as dangerous as the dispensing power of James 2nd. It had been proposed by some of those who wished to set aside the Constitution as it existed, that writs should be issued by the Sovereign to new boroughs and great towns, and that the writs which had been usually issued should be withheld from others; and he would say, without hesitation, that, if the advice given by one of the newspapers, to swamp that House with a number of new Peers, was adopted by the Minister, he would not pursue a course less unconstitutional, than if he was to advise the King to exercise his prerogative with respect to the writs in the manner he had stated. He had not, in all human probability, long to live; but whilst Providence thought proper to prolong his life, it was a duty which he owed to himself, to his Sovereign, and to the Constitution, to use his best exertions to hand down those rights which the present generation inherited from their ancestors unimpaired to the generation that was to succeed it. He contended, that their Lordships had no more right to take away the elective franchise from the present holders of it, than they had to take away from them the property in houses or land which conferred it. The elective franchise was a vested right, which their Lordships were not entitled to declare forfeited, without having some proof of the delinquency of those who possessed it. Borough property was a species of property which had been known in this country for centuries, it had been over and over again made the subject of purchase and sale in all parts of the kingdom, and they might as well extinguish the right of private individuals to their advowsons, as their right to exercise the privileges which they derived from the possession of burgage tenures. He could not separate from this Bill the two Bills for amending the Representation of the people in Scotland and Ireland. If he had those Bills with him, he could demonstrate to the conviction of all who heard him, that the Scotch Bill would create a perfect revolution in Scotland, and that the Irish Bill would destroy all those bulwarks which were essential to the safety of the Protestant establishment in Ireland. Besides, whatever might be the case in England, it was quite clear, that the holders of borough property in Scotland and in Ireland were entitled to a compensation for the loss of property which these Bills would respectively inflict upon them. In Scotland, when the heritable jurisdictions were destroyed, the greatest caution was observed by the Legislature, that those who then held them should not be damnified in property by the loss of them; and, in Ireland, when the Union was passed, and the number of Irish boroughs was diminished, a liberal compensation was granted to those who then were in possession of them. If the principle which was adopted in those two countries at those two periods were adopted on the present occasion, then would the holders of Scotch and Irish boroughs which these Bills disfranchised be entitled to receive compensation also. Any Irish Nobleman, who had received compensation for the destruction of his Irish borough—who voted for the present Bill, was bound, as an honest man to go and return back to the Treasury the money which he had received some thirty years ago as a compensation for his loss. He had stated it to be his sincere opinion, that the great mass of intelligence and property now in the country were adverse to this Bill, and he still thought his assertion correct. He did not mean to deny, that the lower class of people were anxious for the measure; but, in his judgment, they would not be satisfied until much more was done than was now proposed. The associations called Political Unions explicitly declared, they had further objects in view. Moreover, if the labouring classes and the operatives still continued to subscribe a portion of their scanty wages to support contests against the Aristocracy in counties, some hundreds of miles from the place in which they earned their subsistence, things would soon be reduced to a condition incompatible with the existence of good government. He thought that sufficient promptness and energy had not been displayed by the Government in putting down the Political Unions. They had, indeed, issued a proclamation against them, but they had not seriously endeavoured to give effect to that proclamation. The consequence was, that a degree of excitement prevailed among the lower orders in favour of this Bill, which was without a parallel in the history of this country. Be the consequences what they might, he was determined not to participate in the injustice perpetrated by this Bill—he was resolved to have no share in tampering with the Constitution. He would do his duty, and would fear not. He maintained that, during all these discussions, the name of the King had been shamefully and unconstitutionally used. The Sovereign was constitutionally advised to recommend the consideration of this measure to his Parliament: but he was not constitutionally advised when he was brought forward almost personally to say, that he was determined to have it carried into law. For the sake of the higher, the middle, and the lower orders of society—for all of whom, and more particularly for the last, he considered himself a trustee—he was determined, as far as in him lay, to preserve the blessings of that Constitution under which they had all been born and spent their lives, which had rendered them happier than any other people on God's earth, and which had given to their country a lustre and a glory that did not belong to any other nation in the world.

Lord *Tenterden* said, that he felt it to be his duty to state very shortly, the plain reasons which would induce him to give his vote against the second reading of this Bill. If the question before their Lordships were, whether the House should or should not resolve itself into a Committee to consider whether it was fitting to make any alteration in the Constitution of the House of Commons, or if the question were whether a Bill containing a safe and moderate plan of Reform should be taken into consideration by their Lordships, he should have had no objection in either of those cases to have voted for the affirmative proposition; but the question now was, whether they should go further with the consideration of this specific Bill, a Bill which, he had no hesitation in saying ought on no account to be permitted to pass into a law. The Bill evinced a settled disregard to all existing rights. In the disfranchising clauses of it, it went far beyond anything which could be done with safety; and in the enfranchising clauses, it went equally far beyond anything which the state of the country required. For it extended the elective franchise, not merely to the great populous towns which had recently risen into opulence, but also to the villages and hamlets which had sprung up around them. Moreover it placed the elective franchise, if not entirely, at least in a preponderating degree, in the hands of one class. If that class had been a class of men well educated and well informed, he should have felt great reluctance to placing the elective franchise so entirely in their hands; but it was notorious that this class did not consist of such persons as he had just described. The power of returning a majority of the House of Commons was given to a class of persons far below the middle class of society. He admitted that that class about to receive the franchise was entitled to the superintending care and protection of their Lordships, but he did not expect to find any man bold enough to say, that it was entitled to the exclusive exercise of the elective franchise. He could never consent to go into Committee, upon this Bill, because if he were in the Committee he should feel himself compelled by a sense of duty to move that every word of the Bill, after the word "that," be erased from it; for he saw no hope of modifying it in such a manner as would entitle it to his approbation. He had listened with attention to all the arguments adduced by noble Lords in support of it; and he must say he had not heard a word which could lead him to believe that the principle of the Bill they had already rejected was materially altered, or that they were disposed in the present Bill to consent to those changes the adoption of which must form the only inducement for their going into a Committee on the details. A noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) had promised to bring forward a measure of a description less objectionable; and, therefore, he had the less reluctance in coming to a determination to reject the present measure altogether. But it had been said, that their Lordships ought to attend to the wishes of the people, and ought not to act in contradiction to a decided majority of the House of Commons. He admitted that the expressed wishes of the people deserved consideration, but he contended, at the same time, that it was the duty of their Lordships to consider whether the fulfilment of their wishes might not be pernicious to themselves, and if they were convinced that it would, it was their duty not to grant the wishes of the people. He, admitted, also that the opinion of a majority of the House of Commons was entitled to respect from their Lordships, but it ought to have no other influence over their judgments, and certainly ought not to induce them blindly to pass a Bill of which they could discover neither the merits nor the necessity. As by going into the Committee this measure could not be so altered as to become a beneficial measure, he should oppose its future progress altogether; for, in his opinion, any other course would only be adding delusion to the disappointment of the public. But it had been said, that calamitous consequences would follow the rejection of this Bill by their Lordships. He believed that this would turn out a false prediction; for he never had despaired, nor would he despair now, of the good sense of the people of England. Give them but time for reflection, and he was sure that they would act not only wisely but justly. Of late they had been excited by the schemes of Ministers, by the arts of agitators, by the inflammatory productions of the public Press. But give them time to cool and he had no doubt that they would be able to distinguish between their true and their pretended friends. He had another reason for believing that no serious calamity would arise from the rejection of the Bill by their Lordships, and that was this—there was a general feeling now abroad among the people that they had of late been following blind guides; and a very great majority of the nation was ready to enter into and to adopt any measure of moderate and temperate Reform. The measure had left nothing untouched in the existing state of the elective franchise. It introduced a complete alteration in all its departments. It went, at the same time, to vest all the power of the State in the other House of Parliament, and, were it passed into a law, there would be nothing left for this House but to obey the dictation of the Commons. "Never," said the noble and learned Lord, in conclusion, "never shall I enter the doors of this House, after it has become the phantom of its departed greatness."

The Bishop of *Rochester* said, he was desirous of offering a few observations to their Lordships, with a view of putting them in possession of the reasons which would guide his vote on the approaching division. In the first place, he had to observe, that the light which appeared to have dawned on some of his right reverend brethren, and on some of the noble Lords who on the division of last year gave their votes against the Ministerial measure of Reform, had not cast its ray upon him. He repeated, that he was still unilluminated, and he regretted it not, for he was convinced that the change in the opinions of those individuals to whom he alluded was based on expediency, and he did not think that their Lordships ought to legislate on expediency upon a question involving the total subversion and annihilation of law and justice. If the maxim were true "that we may not commit evil that good may come of it," much lesss might their Lordships commit a great evil to get rid of a temporary inconvenience. The temporary inconvenience to which he referred was the press of popular opinion, and the expediency to which he alluded as guiding the attention in the minds of certain noble Lords and right reverend Prelates was the effect of popular clamour. Now, he desired to draw a distinction between popular clamour and public opinion, and, with little trouble, he thought it was in his power to afford an existing example, which was better than all definition, of each. In one word, his Majesty's Government enjoyed the absolute benefit of popular clamour, while he firmly and conscientiously believed, that the majority of public opinion was on the side of the question of which he was an advocate. As he happened to deny the correctness of the motto "*Vox populi suprema lex,*" his vote would be given in opposition to that party who made popular, nay, mob clamour, their basis of legislation. There was no man either in their Lordships' House or in the country who entertained a greater respect for what was termed the people than he did, so long as they maintained their respective and private stations. Let them be commoners or let them be Peers, be their station high or be their station low, if they performed their duties of such their station as honest men, he would respect them but at the same time, he should always bear in mind the saying *ne sutor ultra crepidam.* The lower classes should not be called into council; they should not be suffered to interfere with matters connected with legislation. A noble Lord (Lord Durham), speaking on the subject of popular opinion, had been pleased to say, that if the people of England some years back had been admitted to their full share in the management of the councils of the nation, there would have been no war, no taxes, no pensions, no debt. Now, he begged leave to deny this argument *in toto.* Their Lordships could not but remember the popular enthusiasm which prevailed at the conclusion of the late war. Could any man tell him that there was not then the greatest possible enthusiasm, both in favour of the cause for which that war had been undertaken and its happy and glorious results? From the Peer to the Commoner, at that period, the whole country pressed around their Monarch to assure him of their unbounded confidence and love. He was old enough to recollect its commencement, and he remembered seeing, in the county with which he was connected, the county of Kent, a force of 5,000 volunteers collected, who received their King, George 3rd, with enthusiasm when he went to review them: other such scenes then took place. The whole people were filled with enthusiasm. If their Lordships required further proof of that enthusiasm, let them but look to the expression of popular feeling towards the noble Duke, to whom England's success on that occasion was attributed. After that illustrious Duke's achievments what followed? Was he not fifteen or sixteen times thanked by the united votes of both Houses of Parliament? When he walked through the streets did not the people press round him on every side to touch his hand or the hem of his garments? Did he ever pass through any of the streets of London without having been gratified with the loud applause of the people? And yet after all, what did their Lordships witness only last year? Did they not see that illustrious Duke, once the professed object of the people's adoration and love, hissed, hooted and publicly insulted in those very streets in which, but a few years back, he had enjoyed a triumph nearly equal to any of those which history stated were ever attendant upon splendid victories? Yes, and that too, at the very moment when the carriage of the French ambassador, prince Talleyrand, was passing, whom they lauded and applauded. Such was popular opinion, such the fickleness of popular enthusiasm. And should their Lordships, with this example before their eyes, give way to popular opinion, and legislate on the ground of obedience to popular clamour? It might be asked how was popular opinion to be ascertained? To this he answered, it was to be judged by the sentiments and conduct of the House of Commons. He repeated, it must be collected from the conduct of the House of Commons, but it must be by a House of Commons elected under the influence of public opinion; yes, public opinion, and not by intimidation and mob law. He should have been inclined to pay every possible respect to the opinion of the House of Commons on the subject of the Reform question had its Members been returned to that House under the influence of public opinion, but he repeated that popular clamour went hand in hand with that House, while the tide of rational public opinion was running in a strong current against them. He requested their Lordships to look to the turn which county elections had taken in England since the powerful intimidation and the influence of mob dictation had ceased. If their Lordships considered it attentively, they could not fail to see the strong change that had set in. At that late hour he would not longer detain their Lordships, but would content himself with saying this much—in addition to the duties which, as a Member of their Lordships' House and as a Prelate, were imposed upon him, he could not forget that his ancestors had sat as Members of their Lordships' House, for nearly 500 years, and had at all times supported the cause which he advocated, and he would never disgrace their name or his own by voting for the overturning of a Constitution for which they were content to lay down their lives.

The Bishop of *Gloucester* observed, that since the commencement of the present debate it had been the practice of their Lordships, he believed rather an universal one, to make appeals to the right reverend Prelates who sat among them. Their candour, therefore, he trusted would induce them to hear those individuals when they ventured to explain the motives which guided them in their votes on the present occasion. It was not his intention even generally to comment on those appeals which had been made to him and to his right rev. Colleagues; but there was one of them which was of so extraordinary a kind that he owned he should not be satisfied unless he was permitted particularly to advert to it. A noble Earl whose pedigree, connection, and wealth, might well be the object of boast, the Earl of Shrewsbury, in the course of his speech on the second night on the present debate had thought proper to call upon the Episcopal Bench to give their assent to the measure before them, on the ground that it would conduce to their interests, adding at the same time a remark that that Bench had always been noted for their attention to their interests. If the noble Earl by this remark meant to insinuate, and he confessed that it appeared to him that such was his intention, that the right reverend Prelates who sat on the Episcopal Bench were in the habit of consulting their own private and personal interests to the detriment of those of the body which they represented, or those of the community at large, he begged to say, that he rejected the imputation of the noble Earl with unutterable scorn. If, on the contrary, the noble Earl intended only to refer to the general interests of the Church of England, he begged to say that on a question of the kind on which they were then discussing he knew of no interests which the Church had distinct from the general good and welfare of the country. The interests of the Church, he begged to repeat, were inseparable from those of the country, and whatever tended to the happiness, prosperity, and liberty of the people of England was so far conducive to the interests of the Church. On the following evening the noble Earl again rose to address their Lordships. But was it to explain? No; instead of explanation, instead of avowal of error, or indeed of apology which might have been expected, the noble Earl, with an air of candour from which he had augured better intentions, renewed his attack, and openly impeached the Episcopal Bench at large with being guilty of the most profligate conduct in the discharge of their duties as Members of their Lordships' House. The noble Earl had not brought any charge of dishonesty against them; he had only accused them of a want of morality. He impeached them not of robbery, only of profligacy. The noble Earl had accused them of being the abettors of every act of oppression, of being guilty of every act of extortion, rapine, and robbery. Indeed, he forgot all the words which the noble Earl had applied to the Espiscopal Bench, and for which he appeared to have ransacked his whole vocabulary of abuse. —"Now, my Lords (continued the right reverend Prelate), I believe these charges must be one of two things—they must either be true, or else false and monstrous calumnies. I, therefore, do now call upon the noble Earl, in the face of your Lordships here, and of the country, to substantiate those charges by proof, or admit that his accusations are unfounded and be assured, if the latter be the case, not all his line of ancestry will be able to protect him from the disgrace of having uttered a monstrous calumny." With respect to the charge of abetting tyranny, the last tyrant in this country was James 2nd. He was guilty of various acts of tyranny; and though he would not say who were his abettors, they were not the clergy. It was by the clergy that resistance to his tyranny was first made. That resistance began, he believed, in the University of Cambridge, and soon afterwards extended to Oxford; and soon afterwards the great body of the Prelates so resisted that arbitrary prince, that they showed that they were ready to preserve our liberties at the expense of their lives. They contributed to promote the revolution; and he believed the noble and illustrious persons who brought that about would have failed, but for the assistance they received from the Bishops and the clergy; and the illustrious House of Brunswick would now have been confined to a mere German principality. The clergy had been accused of robbery and extortion; but every one knew that in the exaction of their dues they were more moderate than the possessors of lay property. When, he asked, was it found that they were wanting in attention to the wants and feelings of their poorer brethren? When distress and famine oppressed the sister isle the Bishops of the English Church had been the first to come forward with money and advice. With reference to the Bill before their Lordships, it was his determination to vote then as he had done before. When the last Reform Bill was before the House, on the division on its second reading, it met with the opposition of a considerable portion of the right reverend Prelates, and in consequence of their voting against it they were made the subject of obloquy, particularly by the public Press; and yet it must be well known that of all the Members who voted against the Bill there were none who were so completely free from the slightest suspicion of interested motives as the class thus selected for the obloquy and abuse of the Press. It was well known that in their public character nothing could influence their conduct so much as the bringing about and securing of content and tranquillity, such being the objects of true religion; and in their private situations what interest could they have to oppose a measure originating with Government? Indeed he must be permitted to say, that the coincidence of opinion of so many disinterested individuals as were to be found in the Episcopal Bench was a strong argument against the Bill. It was said, that they were guilty of combination and conspiracy to defeat the Reform Bill. This he unhesitatingly denied. The allegation was one of the many unfounded assertions against them. So far from there being combination or conspiracy there was not even an understanding, and until the very moment when they were called upon to vote each was ignorant of the manner in which the others proposed to act. He had given his opposition to the last measure because it went to destroy the Constitution of the country, and on the same grounds he would oppose the present Bill. The Bill would be but the first of a series of changes. It was to the principle of the present measure that he objected, and not to the Reform of abuses. No man was more desirous than he was, to see those abuses which took place at elections, and which were so often and so frequently the ground of complaint, corrected. This, however, was not the purpose of the present Bill. The principle of it was totally to alter the Constitution of the House of Commons. To any measure having the correction of abuses for its object he would give his most willing support; but to this which went to alter the Constitution of the other House, he was most decidedly opposed. He objected to the Bill on the same ground that he would object to all great changes. The Constitution of this country was not the work of a moment. It grew up by degrees, and gained maturity by accommodating itself to the wants, and changes, and circumstances of society, and of the times. This view of the British Constitution was confirmed by all history. In so far as circumstances called for partial alteration he was willing to concur in it: for instance, he would not object to giving the elective franchise to large towns which in the progress of time had grown up to wealth and importance. The question here, however, was not between partial Reform and no Reform, but between the British Constitution and no Reform. One great and decided objection to the measure was, that in his opinion it contained within itself a principle of perpetual change. He would not enter into the details of this Bill, but he was bound to say that of all the speeches he had heard on the present occasion, that to which he listened with most conviction was the speech of the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Tenterden). When a measure similar to the present was before their Lordships in the last Session of Parliament, the opinion which he formed, and that which decided him to oppose the Bill, was strongly influenced by the arguments then urged by a noble Earl (Harrowby) and a noble Baron (Lord Wharncliffe). These two noble persons upon that occasion opposed the Bill, and used such arguments as appeared to him decisive upon the point, and must have had considerable influence upon several of their Lordships. Now, however, it appeared that these noble persons had altered their opinions, and they counselled the House not to reject the present Motion for the second reading of the Bill. The arguments used by them upon that occasion against the measure received no reply. They were not answered, and the natural conclusion was, that they could not be answered. These noble Lords grounded their present support of the measure upon the change which they alleged took place in public mind since the last Session, but they still entertained the same hostility to the principle of the Bill. It was a most extraordinary circumstance that the noble Earl (Harrowby), who now supported the second reading, declared at the same time his disapprobation of the measure, and called it an unhappy one, while the noble Baron (Wharncliffe), who also gave it his support now, described it formerly as a most fatal measure. Would the noble Baron so far forget what was due to himself and to the country as to vote for a Bill which, if carried into effect, he thought must be fatal to the best interests of the country. A great majority of the noble Lords who sat on the Bench below him (the Treasury Bench) were, until very recently, most determined opposers of every measure of Reform great and small. Many of them joined the Administration of a right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Canning), who was a strenuous and uncompromosing opposer through his whole political life of every proposition for Parliamentary Reform. He did not mean to cast any censure upon those noble Lords for their change of opinion. If they thought the course they were now pursuing was the most beneficial to the general interests of the country, they were perfectly justified in their change of opinion. As these noble Lords, however, were themselves once hostile to Reform, it ought to teach them to be more lenient to those who opposed the Bill because they thought it went too far, that it was subversive of the constitution of the House of Commons, and ultimately of the most valuable institutions of the country. As the guardians of public morals, he and the Prelates who sat on the benches near him were bound to oppose a system which appeared to them subversive of all morality. It could not be denied that at present many abuses and a great deal of immorality prevailed at elections. He wished to see such abuses corrected, but the present Bill would not effect that object. It had no tendency to diminish crime, but, on the contrary, to increase it. One evil it evidently tended to produce; he meant the multiplication of oaths, which had a natural tendency to encourage and increase the crime of perjury. This was one of the evils which he would venture to say would follow from the measure, if it should unfortunately become law. It must also in a considerable degree affect those sums of money collected in this country for the support of the poor. Already a very large portion of it was expended in litigation. To this source of expenses, this large deduction under the head of litigation, at present made from the poor-rates, would be added by the Bill now under consideration the expense of the registry. This expense would fall upon persons, and would in a great measure be collected from that class of society, who could have no direct interest in the elections. He was unwilling to trespass upon their Lordships' attention, but upon a question of such vast importance he could not content himself with giving a silent vote. He felt confident that the Bill would not content the people of England. He did not think that the nation, or even a majority of the nation, called for it. He hoped their Lordships would never be inattentive to the voice of the country, but there was a material difference between the voice of the country and the voice of the rabble. He admitted that the supporters of the Bill did not consist exclusively of the rabble—of those who were incapable of forming an opinion on political subjects. There were persons not ignorant in political matters who were friendly to it; he meant the Radicals, who were desirous to see a republic established in this country. Instead of yielding to the wishes of these persons, it should be a very strong motive with their Lordships, and with all who had the real interests of the country at heart, for giving the Bill their most strenuous opposition. Besides the Radicals all those who were inimical to the Protestant Church as by law established did everything in their power to advance this question of Reform. The Roman Catholics, and the whole class of Dissenters were most clamorous for it. If, however, he thought the measure would be generally beneficial, this latter circumstance would not prevent him from voting for it. Nor was any such consideration at all likely to sway the Bench of Bishops. After the appeals which had been so often made to the right reverend Bench, it was only fair that upon this question they should be heard with patience and attention. He regretted much that upon the present occasion he was divided in opinion from some of his brethren, with whom he had been in habits of intimacy from early life, and from whom he never differed before upon any public question. He thanked their Lordships for the attention with which they had listened to the few observations he felt it his duty to make, and should not trespass further on their patience.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that he owed some apology to their Lordships for proceeding to address to them more than but a very few words at that late period of a protracted debate, when fatigue must oppress them, and when they must, as he experienced in his own person, be suffering from the extreme heat of the place; but he did not feel that he should discharge his duty in the situation which he had the honour of filling in his Majesty's councils; he did not feel that he should be discharging his duty towards their Lordships, and he hardly thought he should be satisfied that he was discharging the duty which he owed to himself, if he were, resting on what all their Lordships knew his opinions to be on the question under discussion—opinions so often stated in their presence—he should not, he said, feel that he was discharging either the duty he owed to himself, to their Lordships, or the country, if he were to give a silent vote upon the question then for the second time before them. However, he could assure their Lordships that it was his intention to trespass as briefly as possible on their time and patience; and but for some things which had been stated, and some charges which had been made against his Majesty's Government, on account of the production and prosecution of this measure, his task would have been short and simple indeed. Those charges, however, he could not leave unrepelled in justice to his Majesty's Government, and in justice to what he knew to be the truth. Before he proceeded to those charges which had been levelled at Government on account of their general conduct with respect to this measure, he would put aside at once some matters of minor importance, affecting only a part of the Ministry one of which had been alluded to at an early period of the night as well as on a former occasion; but the imputation which was conveyed had been partly retracted and partly explained away, and partly triumphantly repelled; and he now only lingered on the subject for the purpose of expressing his unqualified and unhesitating concurrence with the indignant denial which had been given by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government. As far as a man could answer for a matter not within the scope of his own immediate knowledge, he knew from a belief, which amounted to absolute conviction, that with respect to all his colleagues, as well as the two who had already disclaimed them, there was not the shadow of a shade of foundation for the calumnies which had been whispered in public, and which when brought to the test in that House, had received an indignant denial. He referred not merely to the blacker charge, but to one hardly less black—he meant that of violating the sacred confidence which was reposed in them, in respect to a correspondence in which a noble Duke was concerned. He would also slightly notice another matter of a passing nature, affecting some of the Ministry which had been alluded to by the right reverend Prelate who had just addressed the House, who had exhibited the most exemplary and innocent ignorance, not only of what took place four or five years ago, with respect to the formation of a Ministry, but also of what was passing before his own eyes, for he mistook a cheer of denial, which proceeded from a noble Marquis, for a cheer of assent, and proceeded to give him credit for his manliness in having changed his opinions on the question of Reform. There was not the shadow of a foundation for the suspicion or belief of the right reverend Prelate upon that point. The opinions of those who joined Mr. Canning's Administration on the subject of Reform, and all other questions of foreign and domestic policy remained precisely the same after the junction as they were before. He did all in his power to facilitate that junction; and though he declined holding any office in Mr. Canning's Government, he continued to be that Minister's supporter. There were, however, one or two questions on which he opposed Mr. Canning's Administration, and one of these was the question of Parliamentary Reform, which was mooted in the House of Commons. He was sorry to detain their Lordships upon these matters, which were more or less of a personal nature, but so brief an allusion to them he was sure their Lordships would pardon. Hearing or seeing these calumnies out of doors did not of course entail the necessity of refuting them; indeed that would be to embark in a life of endless contradiction, so sharp was the ingenuity of calumniators, and so inordinate the appetite of their dupes; but when they came to be stated in the most august assembly in the world, and backed by the authority of a right reverend Prelate, in so far as that the right reverend Prelate thought them not improbable—then the aspect of them became changed, and they called for a refutation, which was instantly given, and it was equally indignant and complete. In the very few observations with which he had risen to trouble their Lordships, he should follow the example which had been set him in the speech of his noble friend, who moved the second reading of the Bill, by adopting the calm, and deliberate, and conciliatory tone which marked that speech, and which, indeed, was the only part of that luminous, and able, and eloquent, and argumentative address which he could hope to succeed in imitating. It was his intention to lay aside all considerations that could even be thought of a personal nature, to deal in no personal allusions, and carefully to avoid every argument which might by possibility be construed to have a personal tendency or object; and to confine himself strictly to the most material of those charges which had been brought against the Government and the Bill, and the conduct of the Government in reference to the Bill. And now let him observe, in the first place, that he had been a little surprised at hearing it asserted again and again, in the course of this discussion, as it had been asserted by several noble Lords who should have known better in the course of the last discussion six months ago that the Government had introduced this measure in breathless haste, and at finding himself and colleagues taunted now once more, for about the hundredth time, with the haste and precipitation with which they had so rashly plunged into this question of Reform, and so unmercifully urged forward their Bill till it had reached their Lordships' House. His noble friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) near him had that night brought forward this charge once more—his noble friend's favourite charge on the former discussion—to which he (the Lord Chancellor) had himself given, over and over again, strong and repeated denials; but his noble friend seemed to have forgotten those denials, and to be so wedded to this extraordinary charge, that he verily believed his noble friend would repeat it for an age to come if the question lasted so long, unless he could prove to his noble friend, by an authority that would be unsuspected and undisputed, even by the authority of his noble friend himself, that there was, in truth, no foundation whatsoever for the accusation. Happily for himself and for their Lordships, who, like him, must, he thought, be tired of this so frequently repeated taunt—happily too for his noble friend himself, who must have thought the charge a most serious one, since he so constantly recurred to it—happily, he said, for all parties, he had authority which would set the matter at rest, and which he was sure his noble friend would not dispute, since it happened to be the authority of no other person than his noble friend himself. On the first day on which his noble colleague at the head of the Government took his seat on that bench opposite as Prime Minister, the noble Earl (Carnarvon) addressed the Government somewhat to the following effect:—"He was far from wishing the noble Earl to delay his plan of Reform. He would urge him, indeed, if he had any regard to his own safety, and to the safety of the country to bring it forward as soon as possible."* Such was the language of his noble friend in November 1830. Now he and his colleagues did not take the earliest opportunity of submitting their intended measure to the House of Commons; they did delay for some little time to bring forward the great question of Reform, and so far they did not follow to the letter the advice which his noble friend—he was sure in all sincerity and friendship to them, and with the soundest views of what was necessary for the safety of the Government and of the country—had been good enough to offer them in November, 1830. They delayed, however, for a very little time; they took an early, if not the earliest, opportunity of submitting a measure of Reform to the Legislature; and now, at the end of more than a year he did think it a little hard for one who, like his noble friend, had given them such advice and upon such weighty grounds, in November, 1830, to turn round and taunt them upon the breathless haste and the rash precipitation with which they had plunged into this question of Reform: Then again his noble friend, and several other noble Lords, but particularly the right reverend Prelate who spoke last but one, were of opinion, or rather had taken up the opinion of the noble and gallant Duke (of Wellington), that this question of Reform had not taken so deep a root in the country as it was said to have taken by others, and, indeed, even as the country itself supposed it had taken. The noble Duke, and all who had followed him on that side, had insisted, in spite of the declarations of the people themselves to the contrary, that the people did not care much, if at all, about Reform; and to so great an extent had that to him astonishing doctrine been carried, that he would venture to say that if any intelligent man not accustomed to the debates of their Lordships had been brought into that House, without knowing what the subject in debate was, and had heard this assertion that the people did not care about the matter under discussion—that man could have gone away from the

---

* Hansard's Debates, (third series), vol. i. p. 616.

House without ever even having suspected —as indeed no intelligent man could suspect—that the subject so alluded to as finding so little favour and interest in the eyes of the people was the great, the absorbing, the almost all-absorbing question of Parliamentary Reform. Indeed this doctrine must have startled even the right reverend Prelate who spoke last but one, and must have forced his ingenuity to the discovery of that distinction between the popular mind and the public mind which had enabled the right rev. Prelate to satisfy himself that though the popular mind was for the Bill, the public mind was against it. However satisfactory this distinction and its concomitant assertion might be to the right reverend Prelate, he trusted he should be able to show that there was as little foundation in fact for either as there was in the other doctrine of the noble Duke which also found credit in the estimation of many noble Lords—namely, that all the landed property of the country was against the Bill—at least he supposed the noble Duke meant the landed property.

The Duke of *Wellington*, I meant all the property of the country generally.

The *Lord Chancellor* continued—That was certainly carrying the proposition to a far greater extent than he had understood it, since the noble Duke had used the word yeomanry. His noble friend near him, some right reverend Prelates, and other noble Lords, had re-echoed the minor proposition, evidently understanding it as he had understood it; but it would be idle to notice what they had said upon it—it would be an absolute loss of time to discuss the lesser point and its supporters; so with the permission of their lordships, he would pass over the imitators and deal with the great original. The noble and gallant Duke, then really meant to tell the House gravely that the whole property of this country was leagued together in opposition to the Bill. Now let him put it to the noble Duke who had made this discovery, whether it was not passing strange that those who possessed either the property of the country, or who represented the possessors of it, should have conducted themselves in such a manner as to make every body suppose that instead of being opposed to, they were warm friends of, the Bill? Not to go very far for an answer to this proposition of the noble Duke—not to trouble the noble Duke to cast his eyes beyond the limits of those walls, he would ask the noble Duke to look across the House and then tell him whether he could by possibility be right in saying that all the property of the country was opposed to the Bill. Let the noble Duke look at the benches opposite, let him consider how much of the property of the country was held by noble Lords whose eyes would meet his—let the noble Duke take this survey only, and he was sure that if the noble Duke did not see the rashness of the assertion he had made, he would be the only man in that House, or out of that House who would fail to see it. And then what was to become of the property out of doors? The property embarked in the trade of the country? Was the meeting of the merchants, traders, and bankers of the city of London, in the Egyptian Hall, to go for nothing? Did that intelligent, that respectable, that opulent class of the community, possess no property? He was quite sure that if a very small portion of that class of men had met together, not by public advertisement and in a public place, but in some retired room to which the people were admitted by tickets and by favor, or that the few assembled would be secure of having it all their own way—he was sure, he said, that if such a meeting had petitioned that House against the Bill, there would have been no end of references and appeals to their petition. What, however, had been done by the great body of merchants, and traders and bankers of the city of London, called together by public advertisement in the newspapers, and openly congregated together in the Egyptian hall? What they had done with regard to this measure, and what opinion they had pronounced upon it, was too well known to render it necessary for him to do more than allude to their meeting—the very mention of which was sufficient to settle the question as to how the persons representing the trading and commercial property of the country stood affected towards Reform and towards this measure of Reform. His noble and learned friend (the Lord Chief Justice) had very properly said, that the House of Commons had no right to declare the law, or control their Lordships; but his noble and learned friend had admitted that the opinion of a majority of that House was entitled to most respectful consideration. So also had a right reverend Prelate said, but then the same ingenuity which led that right reverend Prelate to distinguish between the popular mind and the public mind had put him upon the discovery that the present House of Commons was returned, not by the public, but by what the right reverend prelate was pleased to call the rabble. Now allow him to inform that right reverend Prelate, and to remind the rest of their Lordships, how the majority of the House of Commons which had sent that Bill to their Lordships was made up. On the last division, 294 Members voted for, and 191 against, the Bill. Out of the 294 there were 93 Members not returned by the rabble—not representing the popular as distinguished from the public voice—but ninety-three Members representing counties; while, in the minority, there were only ten county Members, and they (though their votes were not the less to be attended to on that account) representing some of the very smallest, and not one of the largest counties; whereas among the ninety-three were to be found all the Representatives of the largest, the wealthiest, and the most populous counties in the kingdom. If the right reverend Prelate, who seemed never to have heard of this fact before, had any curiosity to learn how the rest of the Members on that decision was composed, he was happy to say that he was in a condition to satisfy that laudable spirit of inquiry on the part of the right reverend Prelate. A large majority of the Representatives of the most considerable towns now in possession of the elective franchise followed the course of the county Members and voted in favour of the Bill, and the rest of the numbers on the division was made up of the Representatives of places in schedules A and B. If the right reverend Prelate chose to take the votes of the Representatives of those boroughs as an index of the public mind and not of what he called the popular mind—then indeed, he (the Lord Chancellor) could afford the right reverend Prelate some little comfort and consolation. For though the Members in schedule B were about equally divided between the majority and minority, and so might be put out of the question, yet, of the Members whose constituents, real or imaginary, had been consigned to schedule A, only twenty-four voted for, while seventy-seven voted against, the Bill. This Parliament it must be observed had not been elected under the immediate control of those who were to obtain the franchise, but it was chosen under the present system and according to the existing arrangements; but, notwithstanding the advantage thus given against the question of Reform, and, notwithstanding the manifest tendency of men's interests to influence their votes on a measure which disfranchised the boroughs they represented, the numerical majority was 294 to 191, but if the counties and populous places only were taken then the majority would be eight or nine to one, while in property it was much greater. So, much, then, for the public mind being all against, and the popular mind being all in favour of, the Bill; and he would put it to their Lordships whether there was the shadow of foundation for the rash assertion—he might almost call it the ridiculous joke—of saying that the public generally did not care much about the Bill, and all the property in the country was against the Bill. All he could say was, that if they would take men's actions and words as evidence of their feeling, there could be no doubt that the people of this country were firmly, strongly, almost uniformly, in favour of the Bill. But then it was said, "Look at the constituents of the House of Commons: see what they told their Representatives to do—those Representatives who are so bound hand and foot, and ought not to be called Representatives, but delegates." Was it so? He told them, if it were so—if they were delegates, they had been made delegates by the old and much lauded system of Representation of the noble Lords near him—the delegation so much complained of proceeded from the well-working of the old plan, which some noble Lords thought it revolution to attempt to alter. He might have thought there was something of plausibility in this objection on the score of delegation, if he had found that, after a lapse of nine months—during which time the representatives and their constituents had had time to retrace their steps, if they repented of them, if the majority on the divisions had fallen off; but when, on the contrary, the majority had actually increased, he could not for the life of him consider this objection worth one straw. They must attribute this increase either to one or other of two causes: first, the Members must have acted—not as mere delegates—not as persons who merely reflected the impression conveyed to them by their constituents, but as honest, independent Members of Parliament acting upon their own opinion, though not, of course, entirely neglecting the wishes of their constituents; or, they must have been the delegates they were represented to be, and, knowing the opinions of their constituents to remain unchanged, they had continued to act, and speak, and vote, as before. In the one case, what became of the objection on the score of delegation? and in the other case what became of the doctrine that the people had cooled in their ardour for Reform? One of the points, which was a favourite with the noble and gallant Duke (of Wellington) was, that the feeling of the people in favour of Reform was a feeling of very late growth—that it did not even exist in 1829 and the beginning of 1830; but that it arose out of the events which took place in France in the month of July. He did assure the noble Duke that a greater mistake than that no man could by possibility fall into. He should say with a noble friend of his, who spoke the night before last, that the cause of this error—and a great and signal error it was—was to be found in the fact of the noble Duke having, until the peace, resided so little in his native country, for he was convinced that, if the noble Duke had lived in England, as he and his noble friend had, the noble Duke would have seen, as no man of common observation could help seeing, that, from the end of the American war up to the present moment, this question of Reform had been making, though not a regular, yet a constant and a steady progress. At the conclusion of that unhappy and unnatural contest, the feeling of the people of this country for Reform was as strong as it was loudly and unequivocally expressed. The horrors of the French revolution checked and diminished it for a time; during the first years of the French war, the question lost some of its supporters, but towards the end of the first branch of that war, it had not only greatly increased, but had pervaded districts where the sound of a Reformer's voice had never till then been heard. At the general peace, the feeling had become still more strong and more deep; from that period it assumed a course more steady, more uniform, and more regular, than at any former time, and, at the moment in which he was speaking, their Lordships well knew, however reluctant they might be to admit the fact, that it had spread itself from one end of the kingdom to the other. It was impossible to doubt (and the noble Duke must have forgotten it) that the circumstances which occurred in 1829 and 1830 considerably increased the progress of Reform in this country. He alluded particularly to the determination of some of the noble Duke's friends, and the decisions of the other House of Parliament, on the subject of the disfranchisement, and the transfer of the franchise from East Retford. When the country found that, although an opportunity then offered to enfranchise some of the great towns, which was liable to none of the objections now made against Reform—which was free from those strictures, on the ground of disfranchisement, which had been so ably advanced, and by none more so than by his noble and learned friend the Chief Justice—when disfranchisement would only have followed upon crime; when there was this opportunity of giving the franchise to Birmingham, which it was quite consistent to see represented, and to which it was expedient and politic to give Representatives, whether they wished to promote the interests of the country, or to avoid mischief—when this occasion offered of giving Members to Birmingham and it was not only neglected, but studiously, and, he might say, elaborately repudiated and rejected—this gave a stimulus to the feeling in favour of Reform, such as it had not had for many years. There were several other circumstances that greatly increased the ardour of the public in favour of Reform. He could state himself, from his own experience, that, at the election of 1830, Reform was not only a favourite subject, but it was *the* favourite subject of the great body of the community. He spoke on this point from personal experience. When he canvassed Yorkshire, before he went to a single place—or, at all events, before he went to more than one place—it was well known that the French king had broken the Charter. The discomfiture of the plot of the French ministers, and the revolution which was consequent upon it, had something to do with accelerating the feeling of the people of this country in favour of Reform he admitted; but then long before it was known that the French king had broken the Charter, there was no one subject on which the people were more ardent, and there was no one place to which a candidate could go that he did not meet Reform whether he would or not. The candidates could go no where that they did not meet this question, and there was no question that met them more frequently, or that the people were more unanimous upon. Next to this question was that of Negro Slavery, but the question of Reform was everywhere more zealously and more unanimously espoused. Great changes took place at the election of 1830, though not so great as at the election of 1831, when so many changes were made in the county Representation; but great changes were made in

1830 in a great number of places, and in almost every one of those places the change was to the exclusion of those who were against Reform. He hoped their Lordships did not suppose that he was going through all these circumstances merely for the purpose of sustaining his opinion. They were very important circumstances in relation to the whole question, and the whole course of the debate, inasmuch as his Majesty's Ministers were charged with agitating the subject, as if they had invented it for some purpose of their own. They had been charged with bringing forward this measure when the country was indifferent or careless concerning it. He assured their Lordships, they only brought forward this question in the redemption of their pledges. His noble friend at the head of the Government had pledged the opinions of his whole life on Parliamentary Reform; but, at the same time, he only brought the question forward when the people were not only ripe for it, but were actually beseeching the Government to take it up—when the people were ripe for it to a degree they never were before, and when the feelings were more intense and more universal than on any former occasion. If he were to name any one event more than another, and ten thousand times more than the revolution of the three days at Paris, that had tended to render this feeling intense, and spread it widely through the country, he would point to the ill-fated declaration of the noble Duke (Wellington), that no Reform should be had—that all was perfect—that the Representation of this country, whether now to be found in schedules A and B, whether in the boroughs which were corrupt from jobbing freemen giving their venal votes, or whether in close boroughs which might be brought to market and sold by their owners—that the whole of this Constitution taken together, from the less impure parts down to the most rotten, was such a perfect system of Representative Government, that, if it should be the noble Duke's lot to form a Constitution for a country not endowed with one, he could not hope to make so excellent a system, but would endeavour to approach it as near as possible. He admitted that that declaration of opinion on the part of the noble Duke was manly and gallant. No person could blame him for his opinion, but every person must now be convinced that it was a mistaken one. The effect of that declaration was, to convince the people that they had no chance of ever getting their greatest grievance redressed; it made them start up almost to a man against the noble Duke's Government, and it spread far and wide—what he might not unaptly call, that almost ungovernable zeal for Parliamentary Reform—which he and his noble friend found in existence when they were called upon to take office. The system itself was the great disposing cause of that zeal; but the noble Duke's declaration was the proximate cause of that strong and universal feeling which they found existing on accepting office. There were one or two other statements which he had intended to make with respect to the events that led to the feeling on this subject; but he would not enter into a detail or exposition, at this late hour, even of the principal arguments against this measure. Certain consequences, it had been stated, would follow a Reform in Parliament; but he supposed those statements could only have been intended to alarm persons in and out of this House. The immediate and direct tendency of the measure, as it appeared to him, entitled it to the approbation and support of the public. The noble Duke (Wellington) had asserted, that the measure would totally subvert the whole Parliamentary Constitution of the country, and the Lord Chief Justice had made the same remark. Those noble Peers had talked of this Bill as if it left nothing whatever of the old Parliamentary principle of election remaining; but was it nothing that the whole county Representation was left nearly as it stood at present. He would go further, and maintain that the Bill now before their Lordships would act when the alterations were made in such constituencies, to the preservation of conservative principles. It was not correct to say, that the better part of the system was destroyed by it, when all the Representatives under the proposed method would be chosen by freeholders as at present, with the addition of leaseholders, copyholders, and tenants at will. Did such an arrangement not give the landlord every influence over the tenant that he could desire. Then, there was only some small modifications of life-interest; but wherever the Bill affected the principle of life-votes, it rather extended than contracted it, in a sense favourable to the opponents of this Bill. Let it also be remembered that the Bill doubled the Members of twenty-five counties, and gave to others seven additional single Representatives: thus increasing the county Representation by fifty-seven Members. A great number of persons, also, who had hitherto had votes in counties, and who now, for the first time, acquired them in towns, would lose their votes for counties; and this would leave a greater number of purely county votes, unbalanced by those in towns. He would not say, that this was an improvement; but it was a distinct alteration, which would have the effect of increasing the influence of property, and particularly of landed property. Then it had been said that it was not so much with respect to counties that property was underrated, as with respect to the 10*l.* qualification for towns; but great and manifest errors prevailed on this subject. It was said, that if the returns of any place was examined, it would be found the 10*l.* householders were more numerous than those of 20*l.*—meaning by 20*l.* householders, those who held houses of from 10*l.* to 20*l* annual value, and by 20*l.* householders, those of 20*l.* and upwards. He thought, generally speaking, there were more houses of 20*l.* annual value and upwards, than below that amount. It must not be supposed, that all those larger class of houses between 10*l.* and 20*l.* were merely 10*l.* houses. They must not take a *minimum*, and erect it into a *maximum;* and to say, that the inhabitants of the small tenements would overwhelm the richer classes who occupied houses of 20*l.* 30*l.* 40*l.* 50*l.* and 100*l.* value, was an assertion unsupported by arguments or facts. Take, as an instance, the town of Warwick: it had 300 voters who inhabited houses of 10*l.* and upwards, but under 20*l.*; and about 215 who held houses of 20*l.* and upwards; the smaller were, therefore, in the proportion to the larger tenements as three to two. But of those 10*l.* houses, perhaps 100 or 150 were houses of the value of 14*l.*, 15*l.*, and from that up to 20*l.*; therefore, the highest of the smaller houses approached very nearly to the lowest of the larger houses. He could not, therefore, see how the 10*l.* householders would overwhelm those of the higher classes, or how the Representation would, by such means, be thrown into the hands of men of little or no property. The 10*l.* householders did not form a distinct class; they were blended into other classes, by imperceptible gradations. Noble Lords were accustomed to take their ideas of 10*l.* houses, from what they saw of that class in a great town; he would recommend them to go into one of those towns on which the franchise was to be conferred. They would find, that it was not the common day-labourer that could afford to give 10*l.* a-year for his house; was it possible for the man who was earning 10*s.* 12*s.* 13*s.* or 14*s.* a-week, to afford to pay 3*s.* 10*d.* of it for his weekly house-rent? Such a man would occupy a much inferior tenement. The persons paying that rent would be men in the situation of respectable shopkeepers and tradesmen, overseers in some manufactory, or foremen at least; persons respectable in every point of view, with reference to their station; and did their Lordships think that there was such a difference in point of communication, connexion, and influence, between the tenants of these different houses; that the man who occupied a house of from 20*l.* to 30*l.* a-year, strutted by his poorer neighbour, who was the holder of only a 13*l.*, 14*l.*, or even a 10*l.* house? Had they no communication together; no connexion; no habits of society? in a word, had the more opulent man no means of making his opinions known, or of using the influence which superior wealth gave him? The richer man would have the opportunity of making his sentiments known to his poorer neighbour; and the practical effect would be, in many cases, to give him that influence which superiority—not only in point of circumstances, but of character and education—would always enable him to exert. He felt no alarm even in contemplating the possibility of a case in which no influence whatever could be exerted, and which would leave all and every one of those persons to exercise their own judgment in the choice of their Representatives? It was the interest of the poorer, as well as of the higher classes, that there should be good Government in the country—that efficient Representatives should be chosen—that men should be sent to Parliament to watch over the institutions of the country; and it was no less the interest of the lowest of those classes that there should be peace and prosperity in the country, and that the stability of its institutions should be carefully secured. He would not enter into the question whether the rich or the poor man had the greater interest in the preservation of tranquillity; it was sufficient for him that the poor man would lose his all, and that he was the first who would suffer in a convulsion long before acts of spoliation took place, sufficient to ruin the rich man—public calamity, the want of bread, and all the evils that follow in the train of a convulsed state of the country, would be sure to press with the most grinding effect upon the humbler classes. Their Lordships might suffer undoubtedly if every man were frantic enough to dream of unsettling the established institutions of his country, and to introduce confusion into the empire; but the humbler classes, the day-labourer, the artisan, and the peasant, would suffer first and most severely. The men who would suffer most of all were the humbler portion of the middle class—to whom this measure proposed to give the franchise. Why, then, were their Lordships afraid to trust those classes?—why should they fear that such a Parliament as those classes would return, would dream of unsettling the Constitution of the country?—why not trust those classes who were, at least, as worthy of trust as those who were now trusted?—why not admit those whose interests and feelings, it must be allowed, were most adverse to any violent change, to assist in giving stability to the Constitution? Suppose there existed a worse portion of the people bent upon mischievous designs—the populace as they were usually termed—men over whom they had no hold—men who had no stake in the country—men tossed about by every gale of opinion—and to whom agitation was described as natural—the supporters of those opinions about which so much alarm had been expressed—if there was a body of men of this sort in the country could any one thing be conceived more effectual towards reclaiming them, and bringing them back to a sense of their duty to their country, and to a right view of their own interests, than the course which this measure pursued? for it afforded an opportunity of reclaiming these misguided individuals, by placing among them persons capable of controlling them by their influence, and of gaining them over, by their advice, giving them an interest in the preservation of the institutions of the country. With the exception of the scot-and-lot boroughs, the right of voting in all Corporations was now confined to freemen. By the change introduced into this Bill since the last measure was before the House, the votes of freemen were not only preserved to them for their lives, but the right of voting would extend to all who should hereafter entitle themselves, by service or by birth; so that, in point of fact, all freemen would be retained. This was another instance of the errors of those who said that the Bill would totally subvert all the rights of voting under the present system: for it preserved the rights of freemen, with the single exception of occasional freemen, who, under any system, could not transmit their privilege to their descendants; and of non-resident freemen, by far the grossest and most monstrous abuse of the present system, for they had no connexion whatever with any other object that could be considered deserving of Representation. It had been said, both by a noble Duke and a noble Baron, that among the persons who were desirous of disfranchising the non-resident freemen, and indeed who were anxious to throw open the corporate elective monopoly of boroughs, were those who expected to get votes under this Bill. He should not wonder if such were the case. Was it a matter of surprise that so many thousands of their Lordships' fellow-subjects should be naturally desirous of possessing the right of the elective franchise, or that they should feel intense anxiety as to the termination of an abuse which deprived them of rights to which common sense, and according to the best authorities, common law, fully entitled them. These persons were not so numerous as some had represented, and were, perhaps, more numerous than others might suppose; they were, in point of fact, between 300,000 and 400,000—that was to say, some 160,000 whom the 10*l.* qualification would admit to the right of voting, and about as many more who were rated much higher, and who had no hope, under the present system of misrepresentation, of obtaining their elective rights, and who, therefore, naturally rejoiced that a measure was in progress which would take out of the hands of a small Corporation minority, a power which could only be beneficially wielded by the interested majority. But he begged leave to assure their Lordships that there were others who were almost as anxious for this change as those were to whom he had just alluded—he meant not merely those who were to obtain votes, but those who inhabited towns which were, for the first time, to obtain Members; for even though they were not to have votes themselves, still they were assured that their interests were more likely to be attended to and promoted, when the places in which they resided had Members who were popularly chosen—he said popularly chosen, because there could exist no community of feeling between Members of Parliament and inhabitants of towns, where those Members were elected by close Corporations. Such persons, therefore, naturally rejoiced that a measure was in progress which would take out of the hands of a small corporation minority a power, which could only be beneficially wielded by the majority, whose interests were at stake. Was it natural, that the 50,000 persons of a city which, like Bath, at present had nothing to do with returning of their nominal Representatives, or the 150,000 inhabitants of Edinburgh, whose right to elect their own Representatives was monopolized by a close Corporation like their brethren in Bath, of not more than thirty-three persons—was it not natural, he asked, that these persons should feel a deep interest in the success of the measure, which would for ever put an end to all the monstrous abuses of close corporations and nomination boroughs, and make the House of Commons what it ought to be, and what the constitution intended it should be—the Representative of the intelligence, wants, and interests of the people of England? Many pictures had been drawn of the direful consequences of passing the present Bill; among which, perhaps, the most ingenious was that of a noble Duke, which represented extravagant expenditure as the inevitable result of a popular representative body. "If you look back," said the noble Duke, "at the experience of the Long Parliament in this country, or still more recently, of the present Chamber of Deputies in France, you will find that, in proportion as they became popular, they became lavish of the public money." What! the responsible Representation of the people evince their zeal in the people's cause by a reckless expenditure of the people's money. The supposition was monstrous. Why was it that, as the noble Duke had stated, the French budget, in the popular Chamber of Deputies, exceeded in amount the average charge under the despotic, the elder branch of the House of Bourbon? Why, simply this—because, in consequence of a new dynasty and a disputed succession, and because the germs of a civil war were hourly disclosing themselves in France, and because the aspect of Europe in respect to that country was by no means calculated to prevent her preparing herself for the worst—it was, in fact, because dark clouds hung over that fair country, that a standing army, and, as a consequence, a large expenditure, was required. Many changes and benefits, indeed, were expected from Reform; but, if there was one result which more than another could confidently be reckoned upon, it was this—that, in a Reformed Parliament, no Minister could long indulge in schemes leading to an extravagant expenditure of the public money. In a Reformed Parliament, no Government could think of managing public affairs through the mere agency of patronage. A Reformed Parliament, he was sure, would not deprive the executive of that official patronage which was essential to its efficiency; and he was equally sure, that it would not admit of the smallest amount of patronage which tended to screen the Minister from responsibility. A Government honestly intent on doing its duty to the country would receive a ready and energetic support from a reformed House of Commons, but it should stand on its own merits alone, and not trust in the influence of mere patronage, no more than in the influence of nomination boroughs. He verily believed that, as Parliament was at present constituted, for years and years to come vast difficulties would arise, which the most consummate abilities could not overcome; but reform the Parliament, and all the most formidable difficulties would disappear, for he was convinced that an honest, fair, and liberal policy would regulate the proceedings of a House of Commons not dictated to by the caprice or even the feelings of the people, but faithfully representing the opinions of the rational part of society, which, he believed, constituted an overwhelming majority, extending down as it did to those humbler classes, among whom he would say cheerfully, nay, exultingly, that education had made and was making such rapid progress—he said, that a House of Commons, representing the plain sound sense, the rational opinions, the mature conviction, and the peaceful wishes of the majority of the people of England, would be distinguished by a high-minded and magnanimous bearing. That there should be some restriction in the right of voting, in order to prevent too great assemblies of the people, and too vast expenses at elections, he believed; but that restriction he would not insist on in a Bill like the present, from any distrust even of those classes to which it did not communicate the elective franchise. What he asked was, to remove the great obvious grievance of our time and of times long past—the state of the Representation. That was the great capital grievance: once remove it, and he, for one, entertained not the slightest apprehension from the power and conduct of the very humblest members of the community. Much had been said of the consequences of rejecting the Bill. He would not touch upon that delicate ground, as he was studiously anxious to avoid using any language ikely to admit of mischievous construction. He would, however, beg and entreat of their Lordships not to lose that favourable opportunity of gaining, improving—he would not say regaining, as that would imply that they had lost ground—but, he would repeat, of improving, their place in the affections of the people. He could assure them, that it required but little exertion in them to raise themselves infinitely higher than ever they stood in the combined love and respect of their countrymen, and, he was sure, a due regard to their own interests, to what they owed to their own dignity, and to the peace and security of the country, would induce them to make that exertion. By doing so, they would not only regain any ground they might have lost by their unfortunate decision of last Session, but, as he had said, raise themselves infinitely higher than ever in the respect of the people of England. If there was any one feeling more than another which he would carefully guard against—if there was any one feeling which he considered more fatal than another to the security of all establishments in Church and State, that feeling was an alienation, on the part of the middle and lower classes, from those above them in wealth and station; and nothing could be more fatal to the security of all our institutions, than any thing which would tend to increase that alienation, or augment the distance which now separated their Lordships, and the Legislature generally, from the body and bulk of the people. The Bill, by identifying the Representatives with the represented people of England, would re-create a confidence that was now almost lost, and put an end to those suspicions and that mistrust which now frequently paralyzed the warmest and most enlightened efforts of their Lordships to promote the public welfare. They had heard much of other plans of Reform, which were to be free from the objections of the present, and a noble Duke had promised them a scheme of his own. He confessed that he regarded all those schemes with feelings closely allied to suspicion. They were concocted in such mysterious privacy—they were brought forth at such a late hour of the proceeding—they were known to so few persons, up to the hour of their being hatched—and they had met with such little countenance from either side of the House—that he could not suppress his distrust of their being characterized by any healing character, of their efficacy, and, he thought, to quote the language of the noble Earl, that even the noble Duke (Buckingham) himself might return into the country. *sacrataque gestans dona ducum*—the Bill with which he has threatened us—and he would not find that his gift would be met with the smallest acceptance or gratitude. A right rev. Prelate said, that the anxiety of the people as to the success of the Bill had entirely subsided—that it had, in fact, passed away. "Do not, my Lords," said the noble and learned Lord, in conclusion, "let any man among you deceive himself with this belief. I tell you that the anxiety of the people has not gone by, that it exists as strongly and as intensely as ever, with this only difference—that it has stood the test of disappointment and long delay, and, as was justly observed during the debate, of the 'hope deferred, that maketh the heart sick.' It is, I say, as strong and as intense as ever; and you may rely on it, that, from one end of this land to the other, the people—the intelligent, the thinking, the rational, the honest people, and that, too, not merely of this metropolis, but of every town, and village, and hamlet in England, and, if possible, still more in Scotland—hang with breathless suspense upon your decision this night. I hope, I confidently believe, indeed I expect with certainty, that that decision will diffuse universal joy throughout the empire, that it will terminate the painful suspense with which this Bill has been so long regarded, and, above all, that it will greatly increase towards your Lordships the affections of the people."

Lord *Lyndhurst* spoke to the following effect:—The indulgence I experienced at your Lordships' hands in the former debate makes me hope, if not on my own account, yet on account of the vast importance of the question now under consideration, that you will bear with me for a short period. One statement has recently been revived, which requires contradiction—I mean, that the Members of the late Government retired from office on the ground that they would not concede Parliamentary Reform. I take upon myself to say, that there is no foundation whatever for the assertion, and that I shall be able to convince your Lordships that it is totally unfounded. On the Monday preceding the day on which the late Cabinet retired from office, they were left in a minority on the question of the Civil List. It was impossible, at that late hour, to assemble the Members of the Administration in order to decide upon the course it was fit to pursue; but early on the following morning they were convened, and it was determined, as they did not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House of Commons to enable them to carry the Civil List, that it was absolutely necessary that they should tender their resignation. On that day (Tuesday) notice was given in the House of Commons that the then Servants of the Crown had relinquished the Seals of Office. For the correctness of this statement I may confidently appeal to the noble Duke who was at the head of the Cabinet which was so dissolved. In consequence of this proceeding, the noble Lord now presiding over his Majesty's Exchequer applied to an hon. Member, who was to bring forward the question of Reform, to postpone the motion, of which he had given notice. That hon. Member absolutely refused to defer his Motion to a later date than the 25th of that month, on the ground that, whatever might be the future composition of the Cabinet, it would make no difference to him. It is, therefore, evident, from what I have said, that it is impossible to state with truth that the late Administration resigned on account of its opposition to Parliamentary Reform; and, having thus dismissed this preliminary topic, I will take the liberty of calling your Lordships' attention to the immediate question before the House. The noble Earl who moved the second reading of the ReformBill, stated, with great fairness and candour, that in principle it was the same as the measure which had been already rejected by this House. It is so; and I admit that he has completely redeemed the pledge he gave to the country, that the measure he intended to introduce should be as efficient as its predecessor. It is as efficient; and, according to my interpretation of its provisions, as mischievous and as flagrant. As I see no reason to change my opinion as to the nature and consequences of the Bill, I shall take the liberty to pursue the course I adopted last Session, and give my negative to the second reading. In the interval, I have considered with great care whether I was right in the decision at which I formerly arrived, and all my meditations and inquiries have satisfied me that it is impossible to pursue any other course. In fact, I may say that events have even run before and anticipated my predictions of what would be the effects of the measure, particularly in the Sister Kingdom; some of the consequences of the Bill have already commenced, arising out of the mere discussion of the subject, and the promise that it would be passed into a law. My noble friend has stated what is not consistent with my knowledge—I mean, that public attention has always been anxiously alive upon this subject. Surely he must have forgotten the celebrated declaration of a deceased Statesman (Mr. Canning), that, at the period when he spoke, the subject of Parliamentary Reform was quite forgotten by the people. But I rest my notions upon this point—upon evidence which noble Lords opposite may consider less exceptionable. In 1828, or 1829, the Whig Member for Cheshire stated in his place, that the well-advocated but ill-omened measure of Reform no longer excited the slightest interest among the people. The noble Lord at the head of his Majesty's Exchequer made a similar declaration, and to him I may appeal as an unimpeachable witness: he said, in his place in the other House, that the question of Parliamentary Reform was forgotten by the people. When he was reminded of this remarkable declaration, what was that noble Lord's reply? He adopted the statement, and, in a triumphant tone, exclaimed, "True it is, the question slumbered; but we called upon the people, and they immediately responded to the call." But the fact that it was entirely neglected does not depend upon the assertions and statements of individuals; if my noble and learned friend had duly examined, he would have found this decisive fact confirmatory of what I have advanced—that, from the year 1824 to the year 1829, not a single petition was presented in favour of Parliamentary Reform. After the people, to use the word of the noble Lord, had "responded," then about 700 petitions were sent in, in answer to the call. But my noble and learned friend asserted, that what fell from a noble Duke regarding the French revolution in July was not borne out by the fact. My noble and learned friend referred to what he had observed among his constituents in one county of the kingdom, and, of course, I shall not attempt to dispute that which he states of his own knowledge; but this I will venture to say, that, in other places, the elections in this country had proceeded to a considerable extent before the result of the proceedings in Paris was even mentioned. The subject of Parliamentary Reform was not even mentioned; but, as some popular cry must be raised on such occasions, it was merely connected with the subject of the Slave Trade. When the notice of the Insurrection of Paris, and of its triumphant conclusion, did arrive in this country, then the cry of Parliamentary Reform was raised, and then did it supersede that of the Slave Trade. It has been said, my Lords, that Ministers are not responsible for this. To determine that question, I call on your Lordships to attend to the facts and circumstances I am about to state. The late Ministry went out of office, the change of Government took place, and then, after two months of deliberation, out came this declaration of Reform, that astounded every person—that surprised even the party of the Movement, by whom, however, it was at once supported. By flattering the multitude, it at once secured their favour. It was hailed by the Press, and the partizans of the Government supported it with activity and zeal. When the Bill came into the House of Commons, that House was evidently averse from the measure. What was the result? The Ministers brought his Majesty down to this House to dissolve the Parliament. Then was the cry raised in the country; then were exhibited those scenes to which we have had such frequent allusion; and then arose that agitation which will never be forgotten. That agitation is as much to be ascribed to the Ministers, and to the course of policy they pursued, as to the measure itself. On this occasion, my Lords, I will not say that we have been deserted—that there has been a defection of our friends; for after the explanation given by the noble Earl near me, those terms would not be correctly applied; but we have, my Lords, to lament the departure from our ranks of the noble Earl and some of his colleagues. I regret, I deplore, the loss we have suffered from the want of support of the character, the talents, and the statesman-like knowledge and habit of thinking, of the noble Earl; but, my Lords, there is this consolation, that if we have lost the noble Earl's support, he has left us a rich legacy in the eloquent speech he formerly delivered. I shall appeal to that speech, my Lords, for an answer to the reasons adduced by the noble Earl for the course he is about to pursue; and I say, my Lords, that there is not one of those arguments which is not the same that has been used on the other side of the House, that was used on the former occasion, without having the effect of inducing the support of the noble Earl. My Lords, it is not supposed nor pretended, that the noble Lords who were formerly with us have altered their views. One of them calls this measure a tremendous evil; another says that it is impossible that without the most extensive alterations it could ever meet his support. They, therefore, my Lords, entertain the same opinion that I do—that your Lordships on this side of the House do—and they vary from us only in the course which they would pursue, in order to get rid of those evils with which the measure in question is admitted to be pregnant. The noble Lord had said, that the present Bill differed from the principle of the former one in one material respect, that was, that it was not altogether founded on the principle of population; but the practical operation of both measures will be precisely the same. But the noble Earl further says that this side of the House has not on this question the support of any considerable portion of the people. I join issue with him on that question. I say that this side of the House has received, in the course it has pursued, the countenance and support of a great proportion of the people of wealth, intelligence, station, and rank in the country. If the noble Earl could possibly expect, by the vote that we before gave, that we should abate the virulence of the Press—if he believed that our vote would subvert the Political Unions—that public meetings would be held to give support to our conduct—the noble Earl formed extravagant expectations, in which it was impossible he should not be disappointed. But, my Lords, though nothing of this sort was done, still I say that the House has received the countenance and support of a very large portion of the people. Allow me, my Lords, to appeal to those numerous Addresses that have been presented to the Crown, concurring with our view of the subject, but which have been most studiously kept from public observation. Let me appeal, too, my Lords, to the former House of Commons. That House was, as I have before said, decidedly averse to this measure. My Lords, is it possible to suppose that there should not have been a large party in the country to support them, a party by whom they had been elected before this cry for Reform was raised, and whose opinions they consequently represented? But, my Lords, that is not all. Even in the present House of Commons, elected as it was under the influence of agitation and of all the arts that party could employ, what is the majority by which this Bill has been sent to us? My Lords, it is a majority of only 106 out of a House of 600 Members, and elected in the manner I have described. Let me, then, ask the noble Earl, whether, in the face of all these facts, he can say that the opinions of this side of the House have received no support from the people? It has been said, that we ought to give our best consideration to this Bill, because it has been sent to us by the other House of Parliament. I do not deny that we ought to give it our best consideration, it is our duty so to consider it; we must give it a careful examination, but the form of that examination must depend on the nature of the Bill, and the character of the objections raised against it. My Lords, what are these objections? If I object to the details, which I acknowledge to be of minor importance, it may be said, that I should consent to go into Committee, and if I objected to them alone, I would go into the Committee for the purpose of correcting them. But what is the Bill—what is the principle of the Bill as stated by the noble Earl himself? Its first principle is that of disfranchisement—it disfranchises fifty-six boroughs: its second is enfranchisement—it enfranchises sixty-four; and its last and most important principle is that of qualification, which is a 10*l.* qualification. In these provisions the principle of the Bill consists. The noble Earl opposite has stated what is the principle of the Bill. So important does he consider these provisions as constituting the principle of the Bill, that he has told us their rejection would be fatal to the Bill itself. It is to that, my Lords, I object. Why, my Lords, should I consent to go into the Committee if these provisions are to be established? I care not for others, for the errors in them may be corrected; but with respect to these, I am told that I must not correct them, for that they constitute the principle of the Bill itself. I know the difficulties that the noble Earl has met with on the subject of this measure. I know that not a day has passed that he has not been assailed for not giving way to the popular cry, and taking means to control the decision of this House. My Lords, the noble Earl knew this House too well to think of resorting to such a course. No man who knows this House would think of having recourse to such a measure. The noble Earl well knew that he could not follow up this advice—that he could not pack this House; but the proposition that he should do so—nay, the very measure of this Bill, as well as the means recommended to carry it, showed the kind of feeling by which the party, urging on the noble Earl, are governed. I will do the noble Earl the justice to believe that he never could have intended to have recourse to such a measure. The effect of this Bill will be immeasureably to increase the strength and power of the House of Commons, and to weaken and destroy this House, which was created as a conservative body to balance the other two estates. I, however, do not think it is possible that the Sovereign will allow himself to be placed in a situation from which he never can be extricated, except by having recourse to a similar creation. I have stated, my Lords, what I believe the noble Earl to have gone through in the painful sort of support he has received from his scourge and task masters, who have urged it on him. I repeat, that I do not impute to the noble Earl the intention of resorting to such a rash, and desperate, and wicked measure. These were the terms, my Lords, in which a Whig party formerly expressed their opinions of a similar measure, when proposed for the adoption of the Government, and such are the terms in which they will, I am sure, agree with me in thinking that the measure to which I allude ought to be characterized. But, my Lords, if they do not—if the Government are, in fact, determined to have recourse to such an expedient, what are the great difficulties that will prevent them from resorting to it in the Committee, instead of on the second reading of this Bill? Something like an argument I have read, that if we allow the Bill to pass through this stage, we bind ourselves to adopt the principles and provisions of the Bill. My Lords, that argument may be pressed upon us, and, therefore, I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill. I do not mean to say, that many persons of knowledge, of intelligence, of wealth, do not support this measure, but I say, that a great majority of the persons composing the classes thus distinguished are decidedly hostile to it. I ask your Lordships to tax the recollections of your personal observation, and say whether you are not led to the same conclusion. How, then, are we to account for the number of those who support the Bill? In the first place it is supported by the Whig party throughout the country, not that they approve of the measure itself, for you may hear them oppose in private that which, as a party, they support in public. Again, it is supported by the whole party of the movement or revolution, which has become a most extensive party. They cordially approve of the measure, and were the first to raise a cry in its favour, in the hope that it will lead to future and more extensive changes. There is another class of persons numerous, and of great influence, who almost to a man support this Bill—I mean the whole body of Dissenters. Again, my Lords, there is another numerous party, consisting of all those who are dissatisfied with their actual condition—persons who have no property of their own, and who have, therefore, a desire for that of other men, who were described by the historian 2,000 years ago, and who are still the same, and who will always continue so in every period of the world. 'Nam semper in civitate, 'quibus opes nullæ sint, bonis invident 'malos extollunt, vetera adere, nova ex'optant; odio suarum rerum mutari omnia 'student.' Of the other persons who support this Bill, I shall first point out to your Lordships the conductors of the periodical Press. Of these a great portion support this measure, because they prosper by agitation. Besides, they see that as the principle of democracy is advanced, they rise in their condition. Their personal ambition has encouragements which in any other state of society never would be offered to them. Those several classes of persons give the appearance of numbers to the supporters of this measure. I admit that they present an appearance of population that by some may be thought formidable, as it is powerful in its organization. But I ask your Lordships, will you bow to those persons?—will you allow them to influence and decide you in your judgment upon a question of such importance? I am satisfied, my Lords, that the same classes of persons could be brought together, pursuing the same objects in co-operation, to an attack upon any of the principal institutions of this country, if not by the present Ministry, by that which may succeed them after you pass this fatal Bill. They could easily be brought to act in concert against the property of the Church—against the standing army—and against the legislative authority of this House. It is amazing to see how the delusion which prevailed on this subject has extended to persons of high rank, station, and character. I can state no instance of that delusion more curious than the course which has been pursued by a right rev. Prelate, who thought himself justified in writing a letter, charging your Lordships, in direct terms, with having been influenced by interested and selfish motives in the vote which you gave upon this Bill last Session. I should not have thought that it was consistent with the charity, of which an example might be looked for in the conduct of a Christian Bishop, to make such a charge, without any evidence to support it. But I will ask him, what would he have felt, had any of your Lordships imputed it to him, that he was influenced by motives of selfish ambition in the course which he took upon the same occasion? Let it not be supposed that I mean to insinuate the slightest degree of selfish feeling to the right rev. Prelate. I know him to be distinguished for eminent learning and talents, and for every good quality. But what I complain of is, that he charges your Lordships with having been influenced in the course of your proceedings by factious views. But the right rev. Prelate, in his letter to an association, has pointed out a safe and easy way to put an end to the combinations which he says exist in this and in the other House of Parliament. Others have hesitated—others have ventured no more than to insinuate the suggestion—but not so the right rev. Prelate—

> " ——— Ille impiger hausit
> Spumantem pateram."

The noble Secretary of State for the Home Department has stated, and other noble Lords have done the same, that he for many years was opposed to Parliamentary Reform, but that he has since observed the signs of the times, and has come to the conclusion that the change is indispensable. Now, it appears to me a most extraordinary line of argument, to say that your counsels ought to be swayed by timid apprehension. All the writers upon the Constitution, and amongst them Burke, Bolingbroke, and Hume, have taken it as part of the scheme of the Constitution, that they who represent the King should always join with the conservative party; but it has never been supposed that the King would throw the weight of his prerogative into the balance on the side of the democracy. Wherever such a thing is hinted as possible by those writers, it is at once scouted as incompatible with the existence of the Monarchy itself. As to the extent of the present measure—and to that most of the arguments in its favour has, in this debate, been chiefly directed—I must say, that nothing short of a demonstration of absolute necessity can justify a measure so extensive. The measures which have been from time to time proposed by the noble Lord now on the Woolsack, when he was a Member of the other House of Parliament, fell infinitely short of this, though they satisfied all Reformers. But look to what was the conduct of a former Parliament, which had to provide for the succession to the Crown, and for a new settlement of the Constitution. How did those illustrious persons proceed? They attempted no change which was not absolutely and indispensably necessary. Has that example operated upon the noble Lords who framed this project of a new Constitution? If they had looked to it with attention, it would have taught them the necessity of more caution in the re-modelling of a fabric so mighty as the British Constitution. It is said, that our objects in opposing this Bill are the objects of a selfish and ambitious faction. I shall not retort the charge, nor impute such motives to the noble Earl and his colleagues, who have pressed this Bill upon your Lordships' attention. But I will say, that, if it had been the sole object of that noble Earl to crush for ever his political opponents, and to perpetuate his own power, he could have adopted no course more effectual. We are told that we ought to provide for the independence of the representative body. I say that the project of independence is altogether visionary. I say, give to the House of Commons the powers which would make it independent, and there is an end of the other two branches of the Legislature. Such experiments have been made in more instances than one in the history of the world, and they have constantly failed. More than fifty years ago Mr. Hume applied his great powers to the solution of that problem, but the result of his inquiry was, that there could be devised no practicable scheme for a democratic House of Commons co-existing with the Peerage and the Throne. But Mr. Hume is not the only authority on the subject, for I remember that, in a quarterly publication, then conducted by a learned Lord, now a Member of the other House, an essay was contained on this question, and in that essay the same conclusion was arrived at, as had been deduced by Mr. Hume and Lord Bolingbroke. So much for the independence of the House of Commons. A noble Earl, who spoke during the debate of last night, having remarked upon what he considered to be so many blots upon the character of the Constitution, turns round, and asks, can that system be called a Representative Government in which the Representation is so much controlled and interfered with? But I would ask the noble Earl, was there ever, since the first institution of our Representative system, such a Representation as he calls for? Has not the House of Commons been always constituted—I mean as to the principles of its constitution—just as it is at present? But the operation of this Bill, in enfranchising on the one hand, and disfranchising on the other, will render it impossible that the Constitution should remain upon its ancient principles. As this subject has already been most ably treated by a noble friend of mine, in an early part of the debate, I will only point out one or two things as worthy of attention, and leave it to your Lordships to draw the conclusion. Sixty-four Members are given to places whose Representation will be thrown into the scale of extreme democracy. These are to be taken from the conservative class in the present House of Commons, and the consequence will be, to transfer 120 Members to the side of extreme democracy. I might ask again here, what will be the effect of such an infusion of the democratic principle into the constitution of the other House? My noble friend has drawn your attention to the effect of this measure as respects Ireland and Scotland. In the latter the greater portion of the Members which will be returned after you shall have passed these Bills will be of the same class as those returned in England. But in Ireland more than two-thirds of the Members will be returned by the Roman Catholics; and, it is unnecessary to add, that the conduct of those whom the Roman Catholics of Ireland have hitherto sent into Parliament sufficiently proves that those Members will also be in the scale of extreme democracy. Thus the effect of the measure will be, to add at least 200 Members to the partizans of democracy in that House. With such a House of Commons is it to be supposed that the present frame of the Government can be upheld? If it cannot, and I am convinced that it cannot, be upheld, who, I ask, has yet pointed to us the necessity by which we are compelled to run the hazard of irretrievable ruin? Consider, my Lords, that the manner in which the present House of Commons is composed is such as to place it but just one step in advance of what that House will be under this Bill. Look, then, to its character at present, and think what it would be after this, with such an infusion of democracy, and wielding the powers of the purse and the sword; for it will have the power to disband the army. That

House will possess all the authority of the State, and the Government of the country cannot, as a matter of course, exist in its present form. The House of Commons which Cromwell summoned, on a principle of democratic representation far short of that proposed by this Bill, was found, by the Usurper, in the zenith of his power, to be so unmanageable, that he was compelled, by an arbitrary exercise of his own power, to expel 100 Members by one act alone, otherwise he could not have carried on the Government. Such a House of Commons will most surely set itself in opposition to the Crown, and one must reduce the other to submission. The Crown must submit to the Commons, or the Commons to the Crown. But this prospect is viewed without alarm by the advisers of the Crown! *Impavidum feriunt ruinæ.* As to insurrection throughout the country, I do declare, that, if the Government will only perform its duty, it never can occur; and I do not think, that, in a deliberative assembly, any such proposition as that set forth ever can be entertained. And if any excitement should occur, it must be merely transient. But if a House of Commons, such as that contemplated by the Bill, were to be constituted—disposing of our lives, our fortunes, and liberties—a yoke would be imposed upon us such as it would be heavy indeed to bear, and of which it would be scarcely possible to get rid—a yoke, my Lords, which we never could shake off, except by a violent convulsion. There are many other topics, my Lords, on which I could wish to touch, but I pass them over in consequence of the lateness of the hour, and from the feeling that my own physical faculties will not bear me through. But, my Lords, it is said, if we throw out this Bill, there will be a collision between the two Houses of Parliament on this subject. I cannot believe this. This House is as independent of the House of Commons as that House is of us. We have the same authority to reject the Bill that they had to pass it; and there would be no more disrespect on our parts in now rejecting it than there was upon theirs in sending it up, after our solemn rejection of it, a second time. We are told, besides, that this measure is to be permanent; but, my Lords, no person looking at this Bill, at its various provisions, its anomalies, its absurdities, can for a moment imagine that it will be permanent. My Lords, the organs of the Movement party, in and out of Parliament, have declared that it is not to be final. It is not intended to be a final measure. If, my Lords, you should pass it under such an impression, you are grossly deluded. My Lords, I know enough of this House to declare, that, if this Bill pass through this stage, the certain result will be, that there can be no possibility of preventing it from becoming the law of the land. My Lords, I am borne down by apprehensions and alarm upon this momentous occasion, not upon my own account, but for the sake of the country, whose dearest interests are placed in jeopardy. My Lords, I therefore beg you to lay aside all temporizing policy, which must assuredly, if you should be weak enough to entertain it, prove your destruction. By voting against the second reading, on the contrary, you will turn aside the dangers which menace the Constitution, and you will win the eternal gratitude of your fellow-countrymen and of all good men.

Earl *Grey* said, that the great length to which the debate had already proceeded, and the exhausted state in which their Lordships must feel themselves, precluded him from making any long trespass on their indulgence. However desirous he might be to notice many things which had occurred in the course of the debate, his strength would fail him, and he should be unequal to the task. Yet it was impossible for him to remain silent, and not to do justice to the course which the Government had pursued — to defend himself against the suspicions which had been cast upon him, and to endeavour to assure their Lordships that the success of this Bill would not be attended by the consequences which had been so confidently asserted by the noble and learned Lord, and that, if it were likely to be attended by such consequences, it never would have been proposed by him. The first point to which he should address himself was, the charge which had been already successfully refuted by the noble Lord on the Woolsack, but which had been again advanced by the noble Lord who spoke last, namely, that the agitation which prevailed on the subject of Parliamentary Reform was to be wholly attributed to the misconduct of the present Ministers. It had occurred to him to state to their Lordships what the state of the country was when the present Administration first came into office. "I have before stated," said the noble Earl, "that when I was at a distance from London, contemplating nothing less than my accession to power, I was attentive to what I saw of the progress of the public desire for Reform; I received statements, too, from my friends in town of the great strides which it had made there, which were corroborated to me, on my return to town, by many of my friends, whom I met here, and many of whom, though adverse to Reform, told me that it was a measure that could not be delayed. I say that I then felt, and I declared that feeling in October, 1830, that the conviction of the public was so strong that the present constitution of the House of Commons was so defective in practice and so untenable in theory, that Reform must be granted to avert those evils which the further denial of it could not prevent from happening. And my counsel at that time was, not to delay a measure which the longer it was delayed would become the more imperative. That this was my feeling, what stronger proof can I give than that quotation which has already been made from the speech which a noble Earl delivered when I declared the principles in which I intended to conduct the Administration? Among the pledges which I then gave, one was to introduce the question of Parliamentary Reform. On hearing it, the noble Earl called upon us not to delay the introduction of the measure, which was equally necessary to the safety of the country, and of the Administration itself. If that were the impression on the mind of the noble Earl, who, though a friend to Reform, was not a friend to extensive Reform, does it not prove the fact, that, on the public mind, a favourable impression was made even before we came into office? Then, I say, that the statement is untrue that we caused the present excitement. That excitement existed previously—it was produced by a variety of causes acting upon various classes of the community, at times active and vigorous, at times dormant and quiescent, but never extinct, and always reviving at every period of public distress. Then, I say, that we are bound to look at this state of the question. I must also call upon your Lordships to look at what was stated by a noble Baron, both at that time, and subsequently in this very debate. He has confirmed, in the strongest way in which confirmation can be given, what I stated before, that even at the time when Reform appeared to be most lost sight of by the people, it was not dormant. He has told you that he informed Mr. Canning, that though it now appeared to be lulled, it would again burst upon them, and that something must be done to satisfy the people. This was not unnatural. I am not disposed to assert, that the revolution of France, in July, 1830, and the revolution of Belgium, had not their effect in giving additional excitement to the public enthusiasm on this subject. But the question had been agitated during the whole of the preceding year. The Birmingham Union had been formed in January, 1830, and the Manchester Union was, I believe, formed even before that time. Under these circumstances, when we came into office, we were bound to look at the case, and the necessity of doing something being generally admitted, the question resolved into this—what was it necessary to do? And here let me put one question to the noble and learned Lord who spoke last, and I call upon him to answer it, ay or no. Did he not admit, when he left office, that it was absolutely necessary to grant some Reform to carry on the Government of the country? [Lord *Lyndhurst* made no reply] I assert that such was the opinion of the noble and learned Lord, and of all his colleagues in the Administration, the noble and gallant Duke alone excepted. I say, then, that we, succeeding to that Administration, found it necessary to look at some measure of Reform, and the question, therefore, with us only was, how far the Reform should go. I may have erred—Government may have erred—our views may have been wrong—we are erring men, and do not pretend that our judgment is infallible—but applying our best judgment to the best information we could obtain, and examining minutely the situation and prospects of the country, the view we took was this—that something being to be done in the way of Reform, it should be done to that extent as to give us a resting-place on which the Constitution could repose in future free from all further discussion and agitation. We acted on that principle. Reform being necessary, the other consequences were the result of our honest and unbiassed judgment. Then this measure of Reform was introduced, and was received with satisfaction by the whole country; and here I must state, that in the progress of the feeling of Reform, it was strongly directed to those injurious systems, Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot. Those I have declared on other occasions, even when I was most eager for Reform, to be in opposition to my principles; but this measure, founded on the satisfaction of the public—and without it I admit the measure would be good for nothing—was no sooner propagated than all agitation on these other topics was at an end, and an unanimity manifested itself in favour of the present measure to a degree which was hardly conceivable. But an opposition subsequently arose to it. In my opening speech I denied that any blame was imputable to the Ministers for bringing this measure forward, and now I do not impute blame to those who opposed it when brought forward. I trust that I have shown to the noble and learned Lord that the circumstances of the country were such as to require that Ministers should immediately undertake some measure of Reform, and that they had acted on no erroneous view in proposing a Reform of such an extent as, if carried, would go far to put a stop to a wish for further changes. In the course of such discussion, which, I am sorry to say, has not answered the expectations which I formed, and the hope that I entertained, that, by avoiding all personal attack myself, I should induce others to do the same—in the course of this discussion, which has been replete with the most acrimonious language, a great part of the debate has turned on the inconsistency of conduct manifested by different Peers. An attack has been made on others for the extravagance of their views, and on myself for having introduced this measure, from a false notion of preserving my own consistency, or from personal motives of ambition. Something of that sort, though disclaimed by the noble and learned Lord at the time, was insinuated by him when he said, that, if any Minister had contemplated the permanence of his own power, he would not have taken any other measure than the present to preserve it. I am sorry that a question like the present, which ought to depend on merits of its own, has been accompanied by such reflections, and that acrimony has been most strongly displayed where it ought most of all to have been conceded. I have been congratulated by a learned and right rev. Prelate, that I have rejected with scorn and indignation the stigma of revolution. The charity of that sneer, and of that insinuation is not lost upon me; but I tell that right rev. Prelate, that I have a long life to appeal to, which, even those who know me not in private, will think sufficient to justify me in the opinion of my countrymen, from the foul and malignant charges which he, in his Christian charity, has thought proper to produce against me. I have a stake also in the country, perhaps as large a one as he has. I have also given pledges to my country—pledges which must prove my sincere desire to transmit to my posterity the property which I have received from my ancestors—pledges which ought to satisfy the country that I shall not, with my eyes open, undertake anything that is dangerous to the Constitution. The right rev. Prelate threw out insinuations about my ambition. Let me tell him calmly, that the pulses of ambition may beat as strongly under sleeves of lawn as under an ordinary habit. I wish not to pursue further a subject on which I feel strongly; but a speech more unbecoming the situation of a Christian Bishop—a speech more inconsistent with the love of peace—a speech more remote from the charity which ought to distinguish a Clergyman of his order—a speech more replete with insinuations and charges, calculated to promote disunion and discord in the community, never was uttered within the walls of this or any other House of Parliament." The noble Earl then proceeded to refute that part of the rev. Prelate's speech in which he had contended that the King was bound, by his Coronation Oath, not to grant his assent to the Irish Reform Bill. He thought the noble Duke opposite would agree with him in repudiating the use which had been made of the Coronation Oath. Nothing could be more absurd than to suppose that his Majesty, who had certainly taken the Coronation Oath with all the solemnity which had been so well described by the right rev. Prelate, was bound by that oath not to agree to the present measure. The same fallacy had been advanced in the discussions on the Catholic question. He (Earl Grey) thought he had already proved to demonstration, that the Coronation Oath bound the King, not in his legislative, but in his executive, capacity. The way in which the right rev. Prelate had argued this part of the question was Popish doctrine. The true import of the Coronation Oath, confined to civil matters, was a solemn contract and obligation of the King to his people, to execute his office with strict attention to the laws, and to the interest, of the State. The doctrine of the right rev. Prelate on this point was mischievous; he had almost said wicked. He would leave this part of the subject, however, because he felt it had been completely answered by his noble friend, the Secretary for the colonies. The right rev. Prelate had also stated, in answer to what he (Earl Grey) had said in his opening speech, as to what constituted revolution, that external force was not necessary to produce it. He had said, that in general the term revolution was applied to cases where great changes were effected in the Constitution by external force, and by that he would stand. Suppose, for instance, the case which the right rev. Prelate supposed, that the King and the two Houses of Parliament should determine to alter the succession, that would be no revolution, for it had been directly asserted as a right of Parliament, by a law of Queen Anne, in which it was stated, that any writing to the contrary opinion was high treason, and that any speaking to the contrary of it rendered the speaker liable to the penalties of a *præmunire*, so that, if the right rev. Prelate had uttered elsewhere the sentiments which he had delivered the other night in that House, he would have rendered himself liable to very awkward penalties. The right rev. Prelate had supposed the case of Parliament giving the King power to issue proclamations having the force of law. That might be a monstrous power, incompatible with the Constitution, and one which an enlightened Parliament would not grant, but it would be no revolution. He could suppose extreme emergencies, in which such a power might be necessary, in support of which he begged to cite the case of Henry the 8th, in which such a power really was given by Parliament to the King. He hoped, however, that such cases would never arrive again. Parliament, however, had done some things of late years almost equally bad; witness its repeated suspensions of the *habeas corpus* Act, and its repeatedly subjecting Ireland, by proclamation, to the Insurrection Act. He, therefore, contended, that he was justified in asserting that this Bill, brought in by the forms of the Constitution to be passed by the forms of the Constitution, for an object acknowledged by the Constitution, to renovate and strengthen the Constitution, could not be called a revolution, or be, in justice, described as having a revolutionary tendency. He now came to the principles of the measure on which the noble and learned Lord (Lord Lyndhurst) had said so much. He again repeated, that disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and extension of the Suffrage, were the three principles of this measure, and, in fact, the only elements out of which any Reform could be made. Accordingly, all the speakers in this debate had agreed that every Reform must embrace these principles. Even the *ridiculus mus*, which, after so much teeming labour, had been produced by the parturient mountain, proceeded on the very same principle. Even the noble and learned Lord, who now at last was a Reformer—who, in the early times of his life, had never heard of, or argued for, or supported Reform—he supposed the noble Lord would not contradict that statement—even the noble Lord who, reluctantly consenting, admits that there is some necessity for Reform,

Lord *Lyndhurst.*—I made no such admission; nothing I said could be construed into it.

Earl *Grey.*—I really thought that the learned Lord, following the example of the noble Duke, had been prepared to support the Duke of Buckingham's Reform. He now disclaims it.

Lord *Lyndhurst.*—I disclaim nothing, having said nothing on the subject.

Earl *Grey* would take this explanation. The learned Lord asserted, that he had said nothing; therefore, under this silence, they were left to suppose, that he would either oppose all Reform or support it. It was not necessary to press the topic further, and, therefore, he would leave him in the comfort of his disclaimer. It was enough for his (Earl Grey's) purpose to be able to show that a great many—almost all—of the noble Lords who had opposed the Bill under consideration, nevertheless admitted the necessity of some Reform. The noble and learned Lord had alluded to numerous Addresses to his Majesty on the subject of Reform, which had been kept out of sight. He did not know what the noble and learned Lord meant. He (Earl Grey) had himself presented to his Majesty above 200 Addresses, on the subject; and he was not aware that they were kept more in sight than the others. But he believed that almost all the addresses to which the noble and learned lord adverted, although they were against so extensive a Reform as that proposed in the Bill, admitted the necessity of some Reform. In the opinion of the noble and learned Lord, the principles of the Bill were irreconcileable with the safety of the Constitution, because the Bill not only contained the principle of disfranchisement, but it disfranchised fifty-six boroughs; and because the Bill not only contained the principle of an extension of Suffrage, but extended it to householders of 10*l.* a-year. The noble and learned Lord said, that Ministers were pledged to consent to no alteration in the Bill. Now, although he (Earl Grey) thought fifty-six boroughs were not too many to disfranchise, and that 10*l.* was not too small a sum to which to extend the Suffrage, those propositions were no part of the principle of the Bill; and both of them might be altered with perfect consistency with that principle. But the noble and learned Lord said, that he (Earl Grey) would not consent to any alteration in the Bill. To that assertion he would make the same answer that he made in October —that it did not depend upon him, for that it depended upon their Lordships. When the Bill went into the Committee, he should certainly feel it his duty to resist any alterations which he might think inconsistent with the main object which the Bill proposed to carry into effect. But, if it could be shown that any injustice had inadvertently crept into any of the schedules—if it could be shown that any qualification, not so small as 10*l.* would be less open to fraud and abuse—he would not resist the correction of such circumstances. It was, at the same time, perfectly true, that he should strongly oppose any diminution of the number of fifty-six boroughs which it was proposed to disfranchise, and any increase of the 10*l.* which it was proposed to fix as the minimum of qualification. But the decision on those points would depend on the House, and not on him. His opinions were as he had stated them to be; but it was in the power of the House to make such alterations as might in their opinion render the provisions of the Bill more accordant with the principles of it. He found it impossible at that late hour to do justice to the subject; but he was desirous of making one or two further remarks. It had been asserted by the noble and learned Lord, that the Members of the House of Commons returned under the new Bill would be not Representatives, but delegates. He had even maintained that the Members of the present House of Commons were not properly Representatives, but delegates, and had adduced as proofs of the fact, the dismissal of Sir Robert Wilson from Southwark, and the vote of censure which had been passed on Mr. Alderman Thompson. The House of Commons were at all times delegates from the constituent body, representing their constituents in a Representative body. Were the Members of the House of Commons of 1784 called delegates? It had been said by a noble Baron, that there never had been such a change at any election as at the last, and that all old family connexions and influences had been broken up by it. The same thing had occurred in 1784; yet he was sure there were some noble Lords on the other side who would object to terming the Members of the House of Commons of that period delegates. The majorities of the present House of Commons on this question afforded unequivocal evidence, however, of the opinion of the public upon it. After a year's consideration, there would not have been a majority of 116 (the last majority), if the opinion out of doors were not most decided in favour of the measure. Reverting to the charge against the Members, that they were delegates, he admitted it to be true that popular opinion had had great influence in the return of many of those Members; but he protested against its being anything but fair popular opinion which had secured the return of Members whom the people thought best qualified to serve the cause of Reform. But were there no delegates but those Members who were returned by popular bodies? What were the Members for nomination boroughs? They were in the strict sense of the word, delegates. They were delegated to represent and defend the interests of their patrons. If they refused to follow any changes of opinion into which their patrons might fall they were cashiered, and with this difference in comparison with the Members for popular places, that the latter could be dismissed only on a dissolution of Parliament, while the former were liable to dismissal whenever it suited the interest or the caprice of their patrons. When their Lordships were told of delegates, therefore, they should not be like children, terrified withbugbears, but should lookwith the eyes of men and statesmen at the real meaning of the word. With regard to the nomination boroughs, practices denounced by the Bill of Rights, and by the Orders of Parliament in every Session—practices which had been reprobated by Locke, Somers, Blackstone, and every other writer on the Constitution, were now described as the beauties of the Constitution. He could not but admire the ingenuity of the right reverend Prelate, who had contended that these shameful parts of the Constitution were its necessary parts. In the year 1792, he (Lord Grey) had presented to Parliament a petition, in which it was stated that nine Peers returned between sixty and seventy Members of the House of Commons; and he believed that at present that number was greatly increased. He had stated at that time, and he now repeated the statement, that it was not the general interest of the House of Peers to maintain the borough nomination, but that it was only the interest of a few Peers, who, by uniting their strength, might effectually support or oppose any Administration, and thus deprive the country of the benefit of a free and a good Government. It was well known to their Lordships that these boroughs, which, according to the right reverend Prelate were so necessary to the Constitution, were frequently disposed of for money. The practice of purchasing seats in Parliament, however, was of modern invention, and he believed not known before 1760. Lord Chesterfield, in his letters, was one of the first persons who publicly mentioned it, and it was thought to add much to the power of the landed Aristocracy. It was, however, possible, that the demagogues, as they were called, might also avail themselves of this privilege of purchasing seats. Under this plan also the enemies of the Constitution might obtain admission into Parliament, and it had been made a ground of charge against a noble friend of his (Earl Radnor), that he had proposed bringing Mr. Cobbett into Parliament as a proof of the system being favourable to the introduction of demagogues. Horne Tooke, who had a character of that kind, had stood three times unsuccessfully for Westminster, and was at last returned for a rotten borough, and that borough was Old Sarum. In bringing in this Bill, the Ministers had been guided by the landmarks of the Constitution. It had been said that these boroughs existed in old times—true; but it was equally true that decayed boroughs in the old times ceased to send Members to Parliament. It had also been said, that Kings had sent writs to boroughs to promote certain interests; but that was an abuse of the prerogative. With respect to the argument that the elective franchise was a trust, and could not be resumed, he must assert that, if it was a trust, it was intended to be exercised for the general benefit, and not to be made conducive to private advantage. But there was no want of precedent for this proceeding on their part. There were examples on the Statute Book, which could not be disputed. He would refer their Lordships to the disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders in Ireland, and to the union of that country and of Scotland with England, at which period many boroughs were destroyed. These were examples not only of disfranchisement, but even of an interference with the right of exercising the elective franchise, quite as complete in principle as any alterations proposed by the present Bill. It had been said, that his Majesty's Ministers had much to answer for in reference to the state of Ireland; but he must remind their Lordships, that agitation in that country had nothing to do with the question of Parliamentary Reform, but arose from causes essentially different, and having no reference to that subject. It had been asserted, that Reform would increase the power of the Catholics of Ireland to a fearful extent, and would thereby lead to the downfal of the Church Establishment in that country. The right reverend Prelate stated, that the Irish Reform Bill would effect this, as it tended to destroy that arrangement respecting the corporate boroughs which was made by James 1st. He was sure, however, that the security afforded by that arrangement would be in a very slight degree affected by this Bill. But did the right reverend Prelate forget that this arrangement of James 1st was, for the greater part, destroyed at the time of the Union—that if the existence of the corporate boroughs was essential to the security of the establishment, that security was destroyed at the time of the Union, when out of seventy boroughs, all, with the exception of sixteen, were disfranchised. He thought this was quite as objectionable as the partial change that would be made in the constituency of the present Irish boroughs by the Reform Bill. A considerable degree of discussion had arisen as to the King having the power to issue writs to new boroughs, or to withhold them from decayed places. He was not lawyer enough to assert whether this right did exist or not, but the right reverend Prelate had admitted, that the power was exercised by James 1st. Although, however, this might be a portion of the prerogative he was not prepared to say, that the exercise of it would be desirable. One of the objections which had been most strongly urged against this Bill was this—that, under the new system, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for Members of the Government to obtain seats in the House of Commons, and, consequently, that the public business could not be carried on with such precision and despatch as at the present moment. Undoubtedly the effect of this measure would be, to place the Government more under the control of public opinion, and make Ministers more upon their guard relative to the measures which they proposed to Parliament; but he did not believe that a gentleman would find greater difficulty than at present in obtaining a seat in the House of Commons, merely because he became a Member of a Government acting on honest principles. For his part, he believed this apprehension purely visionary; and he was confirmed in this belief, when he recollected that, out of the six Members of the Cabinet who had seats in the other House, no less than four were Representatives of counties. It was undoubtedly of the utmost importance that Ministers should be able to find their way into the House of Commons; but he did not think that the difficulties to be contended with under the proposed system would be much greater than at present. The principle was, that when a Member of the House of Commons accepted office, he returned to his constituents to receive their approval of the act, and under a Government enjoying the confidence of the country, he saw no danger of a Member being rejected by his constituents, merely because he had become a Minister. But even if the difficulties in this respect should be much greater than he anticipated, they were as nothing when put in competition with the disadvantages—and he might add, the dangers — of the present system. Before he sat down, he felt it necessary to make one or two allusions to the present state of public opinion. He hoped that whatever might be the result of their Lordships' decision, the public tranquillity would not be disturbed. If this measure should unhappily be rejected, and consequences arose which he could not look at without alarm, Government would be bound to exert themselves to the last, and to use all the constitutional means in their power for the preservation of the public tranquillity; but the danger of disturbance itself was not so great as that of an alienation of the feelings of the people from that House, and a withdrawal of that confidence which they had been accustomed to place in the Legislature. It was for this reason that he now implored their Lordships to pass this Bill, which he had felt it his duty to propose as a Minister of the Crown, which he hoped and trusted would now pass, and which he firmly believed must pass, whoever might be the Minister. Having already trespassed so long on the attention of their Lordships, he would only refer to one point, which undoubtedly was a matter of great importance, and which had repeatedly been alluded to in the course of the present discussion—he referred to the allusion which had been made respecting the Prerogative of the Crown to create Peers. It had been argued by the right rev. Prelate, by the noble and learned Earl, and by the noble and learned Lord, that the exercise of this portion of the prerogative for the purpose of facilitating the passing of this Bill, would be an act worse than any committed by James 2nd. Although every one must look with extreme reluctance to the exercise of this branch of the prerogative for any particular purpose, yet he was sure the noble and learned Lord would admit that a case might arise when it would be absolutely necessary to exercise it. All the best constitutional writers admitted that, although the creation of a large number of Peers, for a particular purpose, was a measure which should rarely be resorted to, yet that cases might arise in which it might be absolutely necessary. He would suppose a case in which there was a collision between the two Houses of Parliament, and in which public opinion supported one branch of the Legislature against the other. Now, in a case where there was a hopeless variance in opinion between the Houses of Lords and Commons on any important question, he must ask, how could this be set at rest but by the exercise of the prerogative—and by an increase being made to this branch of the Legislature? The exercise of the prerogative in such a case had been supported by all the great constitutional writers, and there was no doubt that the power was vested in the Crown for the purpose of preventing the danger which might arise from a collision between the two branches of the Legislature. More than this he did not think it necessary to say. He at once admitted that only extreme cases could justify such a measure; and he should be exceedingly averse to such a course; but, he repeated, in cases of necessity, it would be perfectly justifiable, and in accordance with the best and most acknowledged principles of the Constitution. The measure then before their Lordships had been proposed according to the forms of the Constitution, and, he believed, it would have the effect of adding to the permanence of the Constitution, to the security of the Government, and to the welfare of the country. He had been accused of having advocated revolutionary doctrines; but he had done no more than Mr. Pitt did, who had recorded his opinion on this subject, and on which he said:—"That under the present system no upright Government could exist, and no honest man could be Minister." Such were the words of a Resolution proposed by Mr. Pitt, and what he had proposed was only to remedy the evils which had been described by that right hon. Gentleman. In conclusion, he had now only to express a hope, and it was a confident one, that the Bill would go into a Committee, to be there improved, if possible; but that it would be ultimately passed in such a shape as would give satisfaction to the country.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, the noble Earl, had put sentiments in his mouth which he had never entertained, much more uttered. At that late hour he would content himself with denying the expressions attributed to him by the noble Earl.

The Bishop of *Exeter* said, he must also make the same complaint, the noble Earl had charged him with making such remarks as he had never given utterance to. He had never said that there might be a change of dynasty effected in a legal and constitutional manner. Further, he did not say that, to pass an Act of Parliament to make a proclamation have equal force with an Act of the Legislature, would be equivalent to a revolution, but, he did say that to pass an Act of Parliament to make proclamations equivalent to Acts of Parliament would be virtually a revolution.

The House then divided: Contents Present 128; Proxies 56—Total 184. Not contents Present 126; Proxies 49;—Total 175—Majority 9.

Bill read a second time, and, on the Motion of Earl Grey, ordered to be committed on the first day after the recess.

House adjourned at a quarter past seven o'clock.

List of the CONTENTS.

Present.

His R. H. the Duke of Sussex.

DUKES.

Bedford
Brandon and Hamilton
Devonshire
Grafton
Richmond
Somerset
St. Alban's.

MARQUISSES.

Anglesey
Cleveland
Hastings
Lansdowne
Queensberry.

EARLS.

Albemarle
Amherst
Bradford
Camperdown
Cawdor
Charlemont
Chichester
Clarendon
Coventry
Cowper
Craven
Denbigh
Ferrers
Gosford
Grey
Harrowby
Hillsborough (Marquis of Downshire)
Huntingdon
Ilchester
Lichfield
Minto
Morley
Mulgrave
Munster
Oxford
Pomfret
Radnor
Romney
Shrewsbury
Somers
Stanhope
Stradbroke
Tankerville.

VISCOUNTS.

Bolingbroke
Falkland
Goderich
Granville
Hood
Leinster (D. of Leinster)
St. Vincent.

BARONS.

Audley
Belhaven and Stenton
Boyle (Earl of Cork)
Brougham
Byron

Carleton (E. of Shannon)
Chaworth (E. of Meath)
Clements (E. of Leitrim)
Clifton (E. of Darnley)
Cloncurry
Dacre
De Roos
Dinorben
Dormer
Dover
Ducie
Dunalley
Dundas
Durham
Erskine
Fife (Earl of Fife)
Fingall (Earl of Fingall)
Foley
Gage (Viscount Gage)
Glenlyon
Gower
Holland
Howard de Walden
Howard of Effingham
Howden
Kilmarnock (E. of Erroll)
Lilford
Lynedoch
Melbourne (Viscount Melbourne)
Melrose (E. of Haddington)
Mendip (Visc. Clifden)
Montfort
Mostyn
Mount Eagle (Marq. of Sligo)
Napier
Northwick
Oakley
Panmure
Petre
Poltimore
Ponsonby, of Imokilly
Ravensworth
Rossie (Lord Kinnaird)
Rosebery (Earl of Roseberry)
Saye and Sele
Seaford
Sefton (Earl of Sefton)
Segrave
Selsey
Somerhill (Marquis of Clanricarde)
Stafford
Stourton
Suffield
Sundridge (D. of Argyll)
Templemore
Teynham
Wellesley (M. Wellesley)
Wharncliffe
Willoughby de Eresby
Yarborough.

BISHOPS.

Bath and Wells
Chester
Chichester
Lichfield & Coventry
Lincoln
Llandaff
London
Worcester
York (Archbishop).

Proxies.

DUKES.

Norfolk
Portland.

MARQUESSES.

Ailsa
Bredalbane
Northampton
Stafford
Westminster
Winchester.

EARLS.

Buckinghamshire
Burlington
Carlisle
Cornwallis
Derby
Essex
Fortescue
Manvers
Nelson
O'Neil
Onslow
Spencer
Suffolk
Thanet.

VISCOUNT.

Lake.

BARONS.

Abercromby
Alvanley
Barham
Braybrooke
Calthorpe
Clifford, of Chudleigh
Clinton
Crewe
De Clifford
De Saumarez
Dunmore (E. of Dunmore)
Gambier
Gardner
Granard (E. of Granard)
Hawke
Kenlis (M. of Headfort)
King
Lovell and Holland (Earl of Egmont)
Ludlow (Earl of Ludlow)
Lyttelton
Middleton
Ormonde (Marquis of Ormonde)
Ponsonby (Earl of Bessborough)
Plunkett
Ranfurly (Earl of Ranfurly)
Sherborne
Sondes
Stuart (Earl of Moray)
Vernon
Wenlock.

BISHOPS.

Killaloe
Norwich
St. David's.

TELLER.

Lord Auckland.

List of the NOT-CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Cumberland
His R. H. the Duke of Gloucester.

DUKES.

Beaufort
Buckingham
Dorset
Leeds
Manchester
Newcastle

Northumberland.
Rutland
Wellington.

MARQUESSES.

Abercorn
Ailesbury
Bristol
Bute
Camden
Cholmondeley
Exeter
Salisbury
Thomond.

EARLS.

Abingdon
Ashburnham
Aylesford
Bathurst
Beauchamp
Beverley
Brownlow
Caledon
Carnarvon
Dartmouth
Delawarr
Digby
Doncaster (Duke of Buccleuch)
Eldon
Enniskillen
Falmouth
Glengall
Guildford
Harewood
Home
Howe
Jersey
Leven and Melville
Limerick
Liverpool
Longford
Lonsdale
Mansfield
Mayo
Morton
Norwich (D. of Gordon)
Orford
Plymouth
Poulett
Powis
Rosslyn
Selkirk
Shaftesbury
Talbot
Vane (M. of Londonderry)
Verulam
Waldegrave
Westmorland
Wicklow
Wilton
Winchilsea.

VISCOUNTS.

Beresford
Combermere
Doneraile
Lorton
Maynard
Sidmouth
Sydney.

BARONS.

Arden
Bayning
Bexley
Bolton
Boston
Carteret
Clanbrassill (Earl of Roden)
Clanwilliam (Earl of Clanwilliam)
Colville
De Dunstanville
Delamere
Douglas
Ellenborough
Farnborough
Feversham
Forbes
Forester
Grantham
Grantley
Harris
Hay (Earl of Kinnoul)
Ker (M. of Lothian)
Lyndhurst
Manners
Maryborough
Meldrum (E. of Aboyne)
Monson
Montagu
Oriel (Viscount Ferrard)
Penshurst (V. Strangford)
Redesdale
Rivers
Saltoun
Sheffield (E. of Sheffield)
Southampton
Stuart de Rothsay
Tenterden
Wallace
Walsingham
Wigan (Earl of Balcarras)
Willoughby de Broke
Wynford.

BISHOPS.

Armagh (Archbishop)
Bangor
Bristol
Canterbury (Archbp.)
Carlisle
Exeter
Gloucester
Kilmore
Oxford
Rochester.

Proxies.

DUKES.

Marlborough.

MARQUESSES.

Hertford
Tweeddale.

EARLS.

Cardigan
Carrick
Charleville
Chesterfield
Elgin
Graham (D. of Montrose)
Hardwicke
Lucan
Macclesfield
Malmesbury
Mountcashel
Mount Edgecumbe
Scarborough
Warwick.

VISCOUNTS.

Arbuthnot
Clancarty (Earl of Clancarty)
Exmouth
Gordon (E. of Aberdeen)
Gort
Hereford
Melville
Strathallan.

BARONS.

Arundel
Bagot
Carrington
Churchill
Colchester
Cowley
Dynevor

Farnham
Gray
Hopetoun (E. of Hopetoun)
Lauderdale (E. of Lauderdale)
Loftus (Marq. of Ely)
Prudhoe
Rodney
Rolle
Saltersford (E. of Courtown)
St. Helen's
Scarsdale
Stowell.

BISHOPS.

Clogher
Durham
Salisbury
St. Asaph
Winchester.

TELLER.

Lord Kenyon.

Brief Analysis.

Of Peers who inherit their Titles—	
Voted for Second Reading	111
.... against	94
Majority for	17
Peers who have been created—	
For Second Reading	46
Against	36
Majority for	10
British Bishops—	
For Second Reading	11
Against	12
Majority against	1

Scotch Representative Peers—	
For Second Reading	4
Against	12
Majority against	8
Irish Representative Peers—	
For Second Reading	4
Against	17
Majority against	13
Irish Representative Bishops—	
For Second Reading	1
Against	3
Majority against	2

* * *

Protest.] The Duke of Wellington entered the following Protest on the journals of the House of Lords against this decision.

"Dissentient.

"First—Because, in providing for the correction of abuses in the election of Members to serve in the Commons' House of Parliament, we are bound above all things to bear in mind that the Government of this country is, what from the earliest period of our history it has ever been, a Monarchy; that this Monarchy, limited by the laws and customs of the realm, and by the necessity imposed on the Sovereign of having constant recourse to the advice and aid of Parliament, is the form of Government best adapted to the habits, wants, and wishes of the people; and, consequently, that no changes, however specious, can be worthy of adoption which would either strike at the principles of the Monarchy itself, or would leave the Sovereign without the power of performing the high duties required from him, without the free and independent exercise of his lawful prerogatives, in guarding the general interests of the State, in upholding its ancient institutions, and affording due protection to the rights, liberties, property, and lives of all his subjects. We feel it, therefore, to be the duty of Parliament, more especially of this House, to refuse to consign the country to so vast an untried change as is embodied in the present Bill—a change of which it has been justly said by one of the most distinguished advocates for the second reading of the Bill, that it is, in truth 'a new form of Government,' of which no one has ever pronounced that it would be practicable, and which, if practicable, would be pernicious.

"Secondly—Because, admitting it to be expedient to correct abuses which may have grown up under the present system of parliamentary election, and to extend to large, populous, and wealthy towns the privilege of returning Members to Parliament, we are bound to bear in mind that it has been also admitted by the authors of the Bill that, notwithstanding, any abuses, and any deficiencies, 'the House of Commons, as at present constituted, is above all other institutions of all other countries in the world, the institution best calculated for the general protection of the subject.'

"Thirdly—Because by this Bill that scrupulous regard to the sacrednesss of chartered rights and vested interests which has always hitherto been deemed part of the essential policy of the British Constitution, and a fundamental principle of British justice, is now for the first time utterly abandoned—the most ancient charters and the most valued interests are treated with reckless indifference, which (whilst it is unnecessary to the attainment of the proposed objects of the Bill, the correction of abuses, and the improvement of the existing system) shocks every feeling of justice, and cannot fail to be made a precedent for still more fatal violations of those principles in future.

" Fourthly—Because, in contemplating the violence done by this Bill to the great principle of prescription, we cannot disguise from ourselves the dangers which must arise to the most venerable of our institutions, which mainly rest on that principle ; above all, to the highest of all —to that one on which all others depend.

" Fifthly—Because, even if the principles of the Bill were consistent with the stability of the Monarchy, and with the safety of our most valued institutions, yet the provisions by which it seeks to carry those principles into effect are, for the most part, unjust in themselves, partial in their operation, and anomalous in their character—ill adapted to their avowed purpose, and still more to the extensive and complicated interests of this mighty empire.

" A preponderating influence in the election of the House of Commons is conferred upon the lowest class of inhabitants in towns—thus virtually closing the doors of the House of Commons to the vast moneyed and colonial interests, and leaving but few opportunities of admission to the heads of the great commercial body.

" The landed interest, notwithstanding the professed intention of giving to it an increase of Representation commensurate with that given to the great towns, is left exposed, even in the elections for counties, to the influence of the trading and manufacturing classes of the very places which are themselves to return Members to Parliament—an influence so great as must leave, in many instances, the Representation of counties, and divisions of counties, in the power of voters from the towns

" The populous suburbs of the metropolis, have been subjected to the same innovating spirit which marks the operation of this Bill in every other particular. Though it is manifest that this vast district, being connected in interests with the metropolis itself, and being the seat of Government and of Parliament, must command attention, whether immediately Represented or not, and equally manifest that the only real danger must be, lest the influence of the popular voice of the metropolis should be too powerful, yet it has been thought fit to aggravate this danger in an incalculable degree by creating new districts for Representation, and virtually consigning the elections to Universal Suffrage ; thus ensuring a perpetual recurrence of popular excitement, in a quarter where, above all others, it is most to be deprecated, as injurious to the best interests of the industrious orders of the people, dangerous to the public peace, and hardly compatible with the free and independent exercise of the high functions of Parliament itself.

" Sixthly—Because the exorbitant increase of the democratic element of the British Constitution designed by this Bill must give additional strength and impetus to a principle which, while duly restrained and tempered by the checks provided in the existing constitution of Parliament, is the source of that genuine spirit of disciplined and enlightened freedom which is the proudest distinction of our national character, but which, without those checks or other equivalent restraints, could not fail to advance with augmented and accelerated force, till all other powers being drawn within its vortex, the Government would become a mere democracy; or if the name and form of a Monarchy were preserved, all that could give independence to the Sovereign or protection to the subject would be really excluded.

" WELLINGTON."

The following Peers subsequently attached their names to the Protest.

ERNEST (Cumberland)
WILLIAM FREDERICK (Gloucester)
MALMESBURY
BEVERLEY
KENYON
GASCOYNE (Salisbury)
ORIEL
BAYNING
DE LAWARR
PENSHURST (Strangford)
BUTE
COWLEY
WALLACE
NEWCASTLE
MARYBORCUGH
DELAMERE
LIMERICK

Jersey
Dartmouth
Caledon
Colville, of Culross
Cholmondeley
Lonsdale
Falmouth
Redesdale
Abingdon
Norwich (Duke of Gordon)
Meldrum
Mayo
Rutland
Doncaster
Feversham
Montague
Winchilsea and Nottingham
De Dunstanville, &c.
Selkirk
Sidmouth
Manners
Brownlow
Howe
Lorton
Wilton
Beresford
Ker
Clanwilliam
Saltoun
Guildford
Clanbrassill
Home
Camden
Vane (Londonderry)
Longford
Douglas
Wynford
Forester
Eldon
Sydney
Bexley
Northumberland
Mansfield
Verulam
Abercorn
Beauchamp
Bathurst
Combermere
Rosslyn
John George Armagh (Archbishop)
G. Rochester
R. Bristol
H. Exeter
H. Carlisle
George Kilmore
J. H. Gloucester

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, April 13, 1832.

Minutes.] Bills brought in. By Mr. Shaw, to provide for the better Administration of Justice in the Chancery Court of Ireland.

Petitions presented. By Mr. Shaw, from the Inhabitants of Anahoe, Cullentra, Dergena, Drumfod, Goland, Lurgacullion, Bockets, Ballynohave, Cranlone, Trillyvannon, Cloghfin, Foremas, Lurganbry, Creagh, Abbey, Strowry, Aghnagar, Altamoshan, and Ballykeele. By Colonel Conolly, from the Inhabitants of Derryscollop, Kinery, Tullyrone, Derrylee, Derryene, Derry, Carry, Deryhirk, Ballyreagh, Inishmagh, and East Dereham, against the New System of Education for Ireland:—By Mr. Charles Tyrrell, from the Merchants, Shipowners, and Inhabitants of Lowestoft, for the Repeal of the Duty on Hemp; and from the Stoke and Melford Political Unions, against the Friendly Acts Amendment Bill:—By Colonel Conolly, from the Inhabitants of Tully, and Aughrish, (Donegal); and by Mr. Henry Grattan, from the Landholders and Inhabitants of Navan, Crossmoline, Collumbkill, Ballycormick, Templemichael, Kentstown, Ballymagarvey, Tryholland, Shrule-Ardeath, Clonalvey, and Piecetown. By Sir John Bourke, from the Landowners, and Parishioners of Doneraile, to make the Tithe Composition Act compulsory:—By Mr. Loch, from the Corporation of the Royal Burgh of Tain, to substitute the Magistrates of Burghs instead of Sheriffs as Returning Officers on the Scotch Reform Bill:—By Mr. Godson, from the Freemen of the Borough of Stafford, against the General Register Bill:—By Mr. Spring Rice, from the East India Company, against the Claim made by Mr. Bury Hutchinson:—By Lord Acheson, from the Inhabitants of Meigh, for the Repeal of the Tithe and Vestry Laws (Ireland).

Education (Ireland).] Mr. *Shaw* presented a Petition from Plymouth signed by 300 persons, twenty-four of whom were clergymen, another from the diocese of Ross in the county of Cork, and a third from the Sunday-School teachers residing in Dublin, against the new plan of Education in Ireland. The last of these was, in his opinion, a most important petition; it emanated from a body of most respectable persons, who devoted their time gratuitously to attendance upon the schools. He had other petitions upon the same subject, but he rose chiefly to notice the assertion made in another place by the noble Earl at the head of the Government. The noble Earl, in quoting the observations of the Commissioners of Education Enquiry with respect to a supposed discrepancy between the number of schools returned to them by the Kildare-street Society and the number apparently in connexion with the Society, according to the Returns made by the clergy said, that, according to the Returns of the latter, there were but 900 schools in connexion with the Society, while that of the former made the number 1,500 who received aid from their funds. This statement was most satisfactorily answered in the Sixteenth Report of the Society, which showed that half the number were not connected with that Society until after the clergy had made their Returns, and the other half were schools which they returned without being aware of the connexion between them and the Society.

He had stated this to give the noble Earl an opportunity of correcting his mistake which he was sure he had made unintentionally.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* supported the petitions, and stated, that he had upwards of thirty petitions to the same effect to present.

Colonel *Conolly* complained, that sufficient attention had not been paid by the House to petitions of so important a nature, and which were well worthy its best attention. He most cordially supported the prayer of these petitions.

Petitions to lie on the Table, and be printed.

TITHES (IRELAND).] Mr. *Henry Grattan* presented a Petition from the inhabitants of Paisley in Scotland, against the system of Tithes. The petitioners conceived the system, although founded in law, both unchristian and unjust.

Mr. *Hume* said, he had been requested to support the petition, which he did with great satisfaction. He rejoiced in having such a proof that the people of Great Britain sympathized with the Irish people on this question.

Sir *Frederick Trench* said, that, while nine-tenths of the property in Ireland was in the possession of Protestants, the clergy were entitled to their tithes. On this subject he wished hon. Members would give an attentive perusal to a letter of Lord Milton's, which had appeared in the public journals a short time back.

Petition to be printed.

Mr. *Henry Grattan* presented a petition from Johnstown, complaining of the exorbitant charges for tithes made in that place, the system had become so oppressive that the inhabitants had been compelled to make up a joint stock purse to resist the demands of the clergy. He fully coincided in the language of a celebrated writer, who hoped that the hatred of the people of Ireland to tithes would be as lasting as their love of justice.

Mr. *Shaw* said, that he had no doubt the statements in the petition were much exaggerated. It was notorious that the clergy of Ireland did not receive one-thirtieth of the amount received by the Irish landlords.

Colonel *Perceval* said, he must also oppose the sentiments contained in these petitions. He attributed much of the opposition in Ireland which had been manifested to tithes to the conduct of those individuals who had given utterance to sentiments so much admired and extolled by the hon. member for Meath, but which were conducive to the cruel and unchristian consequences under which the Protestant clergy of Ireland laboured.

Mr. *Shaw* observed, that in one of the petitions, the Protestant clergy were denominated "absentee harpies," and he submitted that the hon. member for Meath, under such circumstances, ought not to press the reading of the petition.

Mr. *Henry Grattan* said, he did not press for the petition being printed, but he thought it but right to have it read, and laid on the Table.

Sir *Edward Sugden* conceived, that, since it was discovered that this petition had been improperly worded, the hon. Member could not ask that either it or any of those which accompanied it, should be read until he could answer for their contents.

Mr. *Grattan* moved, that the petitions be read, and the gallery was cleared for a division. None, however, took place, Mr. Grattan abandoning his Motion.

Lord *Althorp* moved the Order of the Day for the House to go into a Committee of Supply.

TREATY WITH FRANCE.] Mr. *Robinson* begged to ask the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, whether the Treaty with France relating to the tonnage on British vessels was yet complete as he understood the old duties were still demanded in the French ports?

Lord Palmerston said, the arrangements with France were finally agreed upon, but he was not aware whether orders founded thereon had yet been issued at the French ports.

MADEIRA.] Sir *Robert Peel* begged to ask the noble Lord at the head of foreign affairs, whether any information had been received of the blockade of the island of Madeira by a British Admiral?

Lord *Palmerston* replied in the negative.

SUPPLY—MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES.] The House in Committee of Supply.

418,000*l.* was granted to defray the expenses of the Commissariat Department; and 70,800*l.* for the repairs of public offices, royal palaces and gardens, in England and Scotland.

A vote of 7,875*l.* for alterations in the Palace in Brighton was proposed.

Mr. *Dawson* said, he did not then intend to make any objections to the vote, but he understood the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary of the Treasury, to say last year, that no vote would in future be proposed without the whole Estimates, particularly for new buildings, being before the House, and as he found the erections for which this money was to be granted, partook of that character, and the whole Estimate was 15,000*l.* he wished to be informed how it was they were now called upon for only a part of that sum.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the other part of the money had been voted last year, and this sum would, he hoped, complete the building. It was an erection attached to the Palace for the accommodation of servants.

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* said, as the House was on the subject of public buildings, he thought that a fair opportunity for proposing that a house in Pall-mall, the property of his Majesty, called Dysart House, should be given up for the purposes of a National Gallery. It was at present occupied by the royal collection of pictures, but as they would shortly be removed to Buckingham Palace, a sum of money not more than 1,500*l.* would be required to fit Dysart House for the reception of the national pictures, and they really deserved a better abode than they occupied at present.

Sir *Robert Peel* did not rise to second the proposition of the right hon. Member, but to make another one, of, perhaps, a more liberal nature. He wished that a definite sum should be especially appropriated to raise a new and suitable building for the National Gallery. This was, truly, a national consideration. The noble collection of pictures which it contained was visited, not only by the inhabitants of the metropolis, but by persons from the most distant corners of the empire, to whom it was a source of the highest gratification. The number of such visitants was upwards of 100,000 in the year, and their convenience deserved the attention of the House. Independently of this consideration, the collection was in itself so fine and so valuable as to deserve an exhibition-room of the choicest construction. It had cost, at least, 150,000*l.*, of which Mr. Holwell Carr's munificent gift alone was valued at 25,000*l.* But motives of public gratification were not the only ones which appealed to the House on this matter; the interest of our manufactures was also involved in every encouragement being held out to the fine arts in this country. It was well known that our manufacturers were, in all matters connected with machinery, superior to all their foreign competitors; but, in the pictorial designs, which were so important in recommending the productions of industry to the taste of the consumer, they were, unfortunately, not equally successful; and hence they had found themselves unequal to cope with their rivals. This deserved the serious consideration of the House in its patronage of the fine arts. For his part, although fully aware of the importance of economy, and most anxious to observe it, he thought this was an occasion for liberality, and, that the House would do well to grant freely a sum of 30,000*l.* for the construction of a suitable edifice for the reception of our noble national collection of pictures. He thought the country would be amply repaid if it devoted a sum of 30,000*l.* for the purpose of erecting a suitable gallery for the reception of the valuable collection of national paintings.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with the right hon. Baronet that it was right and fit that a place should be provided for the reception of the pictures, which would be convenient to the public, but he was not prepared to go to any architectural expense for that purpose.

Sir *Robert Peel* repeated, that he thought it of importance that immediate measures should be taken for providing a gallery; he did not wish to erect an expensive building, the architectural magnificence of which would be attended with great expense, but merely a plain and suitable gallery, with a proper light to view the paintings with advantage.

Mr. *Warburton* concurred in the opinion expressed by the hon. Baronet. He had no doubt it would tend materially to an improvement in our manufactures; and he thought that the expense incurred would be paid over and over again by the advantages derived by the country. He would have no old house selected, but a plain gallery built expressly for the purpose.

Lord *Duncannon* readily admitted that the present building in which the paintings were exhibited was in a state of insecurity; but he feared that Dysart House was not in a much better state of repair.

Lord *Ashley* observed, that the patronage of works of science and art, such as the calculating machine of Mr. Babbage, had collateral advantages. Some improvements in machinery had lately taken place in Glasgow from the contemplation of that machine. He considered that the erection of a gallery would be extremely beneficial for artists and mechanics to resort to, and he had reason for believing that it would be frequented by the industrious classes, instead of resorting to alehouses, as at present.

Sir *Frederick Trench* considered, that, instead of expending large sums on Buckingham Palace, it would have been better to have adopted his plan for converting it into a national museum or gallery. He had recently inspected the building, and he felt assured it would never be fit for the reception of the King and Queen, until the whole of the houses forming Stafford-row were pulled down. The building contained a gallery, which, with very little trouble, might be formed into one of upwards of 500 feet in length, and, both in extent and beauty, would excel that of the Louvre.

Mr. *Hume* thought, that the greatest advantages might be gained in the improvement of our manufactures, and at very little expense. There was only one man at Coventry who was at all proficient in forming designs for silks, and we had invariably to copy from foreigners in articles of taste, although our machinery was so far superior. At Lyons there was a School of Design, with numerous students, entirely for the purpose of improvement in patterns and articles of taste. Hence the superiority of the French in this respect to our manufacturers. He, therefore, was an advocate for the nation to erect a proper building, and he thought such a one could be had without putting the public to any expense. There were large sums of money spent annually for keeping palaces in repair which were not used for the royal accommodation, but for that of individuals. Hampton Court, for instance, had cost, in the last four years, upwards of 19,000*l.* for repairs, and it was occupied by forty-four persons who had no claim upon the public; that sum might be saved and appropriated to the erection of a gallery, and the palace pulled down. Then, again, large sums were devoted to the maintenance of Kensington Palace and Windsor Great Park. He had no objection to the Duchess of Kent and the Duke of Sussex residing in Kensington Palace, but he was informed that one whole wing of the palace was occupied by a Mrs. Croker, which portion was formerly the residence of the late Queen Caroline.

Mr. *Spring Rice* observed, that all the sums alluded to by the hon. member for Middlesex had been discussed over and over again, and disposed of on previous votes. By the junction of the office of Surveyor of Works to that of the Woods and Forests, a very considerable saving would be made, prospectively amounting to 12,000*l.* per annum. As to the expenses of Buckingham Palace and Windsor Castle, these had been submitted to Committees, and there was not the slightest inclination to any excess of the Estimates. With reference to the apartments occupied by Mrs. Croker, the hon. Member was quite misinformed as to the space occupied by that lady, as she had only four rooms, and those of very confined dimensions.

General *Stephenson* said, as the hon. member for Middlesex had made some remarks relating to the expenses of Hampton Court Palace, he was anxious to state, that no part of them were attributable to his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, who was Ranger of the Park.

Mr. *Hume* said, he had not the most remote intention to throw any reflections upon the Ranger of Hampton Court Park. No man had a greater respect for the Duke of Sussex than he had, but, he must say, that, if they were called upon, every day almost, for money to build new palaces and repair old ones, there would be no end to expense; it would certainly be better to pull down those old palaces which were not used for royal accommodation, several of them were little better than barracks for destitute persons, and those not always selected from the most deserving.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, he could not allow the hon. Member's remarks to pass without observation. He hoped both he and the House would refer to the returns relative to the hereditary revenues of the Crown, by which it was evident the public had gained no less a sum than 29,000,000*l.* by the bargain relative to the Civil List. He begged to ask, whether, after this liberal conduct from the Monarch, it was right that he should be denied a few thousand pounds annually to keep his palaces in a proper state of repair? He thought that, with respect to Hampton Court Palace, the expenses were small; and that building was so associated with the best passages in the history of the country that it ought to be preserved.

Mr. *Gally Knight* had also heard with much regret the remarks of the hon. Member relating to the royal palaces. In France, even since the Revolution of 1830, the whole of the palaces were left at the disposal of the citizen king, and would the hon. Member be less liberal than our neighbours were in that respect, sweeping away all the historical recollections connected with our ancient buildings, and reducing this country to the condition of the United States? Then, again, he had proposed to turn the inmates of these palaces out, but did he think poverty was less pinching to them who had seen better days? With regard to the question more immediately before the House, relating to a picture gallery, he rejoiced that the proposition had been so favourably received, and he hoped Ministers would not be slow in acting upon it.

Mr. *Hume* said, he believed the hon. Member was incorrect with regard to the royal parks and palaces in France. He believed some part of the domains had recently been ordered to be sold by the legislature, and he still thought it objectionable that apartments should be assigned to individuals in palaces. If a person in the middle walks of life fell into poverty, his relatives were compelled to support him; but the country was to be saddled with the expense of keeping the relatives of a great man, according to the hon. Member's doctrine.

Vote agreed to.

As were votes of 5,688*l.*, for the repairs of Portpatrick harbour; of 5,000*l.*, for Donaghadee harbour, and of 5,918*l.*, for the repairs of Holyhead and Howth roads and harbour.

On the sum of 10,000*l.*, to defray the expense of the new buildings at the British Museum, being proposed,

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* said, there had recently been some discussion in the public prints relating to one of Cleopatra's needles, as they were called, one of which, he understood, had been presented to the country as a trophy of the victories obtained by our army in Egypt. He wished to know if there was any hope of having the monument brought to this country?

Lord *Althorp*, in reply, stated, that one of the obelisks, called Cleopatra's needles, had been given by the Egyptian government to the French, who were making preparations to bring it away, and the subject had been under his (Lord Althorp's) consideration, because it was a good opportunity to bring away the other, which had been given to us. With that view he had made inquiry as to the probable expense of the conveyance, and he understood the estimate was 15,000*l.* He owned he had hoped a less sum would have been sufficient, but the House must be aware that the carrying away an obelisk sixty-seven feet long, and 248 ton weight, must be expensive. But as the same machinery would serve for both, he thought it might be arranged so as that the French government would bear half the expense.

Mr. *Hume* said, that a large sum of money had been subscribed by the troops and seamen employed in Egypt towards the expense of removing this relic of antiquity. This sum amounted, he believed, to 7,000*l.*, and had been lying in the Treasury for years. He thought it might be removed for much less than the sum stated by the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer; by remaining where it was, it was subject to be, and he had heard that it had been, mutilated.

Sir *George Clerk* said, he must also express his very great gratification that there was at length an intention to bring the obelisk to England. It was a disgrace to the country that it had so long been neglected.

Lord *Althorp* said, as there appeared to be a general wish to have this great work of art brought home, he could assure the House that he would not lose sight of the subject.

The Resolution agreed to, as were the following:—

50,000*l.* for repairs and alterations of Windsor Castle.

9,500*l.* for the erection of a State Paper Office.

6,000*l.* for the works at the College of Edinburgh.

14,514*l.* for the salaries of the officers of the Houses of Lords and Commons, pensions of retired officers of both Houses, and a sum in aid of the Fee Fund.

15,300*l.* for expenses of the Houses of Lords and Commons.

38,200*l.* to make good the deficiency of the Fee Fund for the department of the Treasury.

13,900*l.* for the deficiency of the Fee Fund for the department of the Home Secretary of State.

16,895*l.* for the deficiency of the Fee Fund for the department of the Foreign Secretary of State.

14,930*l.* for the like purpose, at the Colonial Office.

17,504*l.* for the like purpose, at the Council Office.

2,000*l.* for the Salary of the Lord Privy Seal.

9,400*l.* for contingent expenses, and messengers' bills of the Treasury department.

8,460*l.* for contingent expenses, and messengers' bills of the Home Secretary's Office.

On the Resolution for granting 47,750*l.* for contingent expenses and messengers' bills in the department of the Foreign Secretary of State,

Mr. *Hume* objected to the large amount of this vote, it appeared an enormous sum to pay for messengers. He wished that they should retire from interference in foreign affairs, instead of which the Ministers were apparently more deeply involving the country in them daily.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that the expense had been incurred by endeavours to maintain the peace of Europe, and not for any improper interference. If the hon. Member considered the state of the continent during the last year, he would find enough to account for the charge; besides, the expenses of the Foreign Office had been very materially decreased by his noble friend at present at the head of that department. In 1831, the expenses had been less than in the year before by 66,500*l.*, and in the present year they had been further reduced 32,000*l.*, making a total saving of 98,500*l.* Even the late Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had made reductions to the extent of 34,000*l.*, this curtailment reflected great credit upon both parties.

Mr. *Wrangham* said, a part of the reductions made by the present Foreign Secretary ought to be placed to the credit of the last, as important savings were in progress when he left that department, and it was clear such diminutions of expense could only be effected gradually. As to the expense of messengers, he could state the greatest economy was practised in that respect when he was connected with the Foreign Department.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he must complain of the absence of the noble Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The noble Lord was so seldom in the House that he thought it might be better to throw a little salt upon his tail; besides he could not refrain from alluding to the fact, that whenever large sums of the public money were voted away very few Members were present. On the present occasion a sufficient number were not present properly to constitute a legal House. He did not mean to be offensive. He did not intend to call the attention of the Chairman to the circumstance, as he thought he should not effect any good purpose by it. He despaired of economy being practised, until they got a Reformed Parliament. When they did get it, he sincerely hoped that a different system to that now pursued in the voting the public money away would be pursued.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the hon Member's reproach applied to himself, for he had been absent during several of the votes.

The Resolution agreed to, as were the following:—

5,055*l.* for contingent expenses, and messengers' bills in the department of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

4,750*l.* for contingent expenses, and messengers' bills in the department of the Privy Council.

On the Resolution for 5,400*l.* for the expense of messengers attending the First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, and allowances to officers of the Court,

Mr. *Hunt* said, that here was a sum of money demanded for the expense of messengers who attended on those noble Lords amounting to nearly as much as the salary of the President of the United States of America.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know how it was, that the increase took place in this item for this year, when the vote of last year, under this head, was only 2,000*l.*? The sum now demanded was 5,000*l.* for the five quarters.

Mr. *Hunt:* So much for the economising and retrenching Government.

Mr. *Spring Rice* was obliged to the hon. Gentleman for his expression of "an economising and retrenching Government." To show that the present Government deserved the character which that expression implied, he would only state, that the sum voted for these Estimates last year amounted to 2,284,000*l.*, from which sum the Government had been able to make reductions for the present year to the amount of 519,375*l.* The reason this item was larger this year, was, that he had last year taken too small a vote to meet the expenses of this office. The sum now asked was to meet the deficiency of last year and to provide against any arrear for the future. He was ready to go into a vindication of every item proposed; and he felt confident that the present Government had, with regard to these, and every other Estimate, done all they could to entitle them to the character of an economizing and retrenching Government.

Vote agreed to.

The next item proposed was the sum of 958*l.* to defray the expenses of the salaries of certain Professors at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, for lectures delivered by them.

Mr. *Hunt* objected to this vote. He did not see why the labouring and working classes of this country should have to pay Professors at the Universities to instruct the sons of the Aristocracy of the country. He had made the same objection last year, but had been told by the noble Lord, the member for Northamptonshire, that the humbler classes had been much benefitted by the discoveries of scientific persons. He had since found, however, that the greater part of the improvements in machinery had been made by mechanics and not by Professors.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, if the hon. Member brought the same objection now as he had done on a former occasion, the hon. Member would of course receive the same answer; he must deny, however, that this sum was given to teach the sons of the Aristocracy alone. Many highly talented individuals had received their education at the Universities, who had sprung from the humblest classes in life. They had had the benefit of this vote, not to speak of the other charitable foundations in the Universities.

Mr. *Hume* thought that the Universities would consult their own dignity more by supplying this sum out of their own ample resources, instead of taking it out of the pockets of the people. There were Colleges in both these establishments, he understood, which had 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* a-year revenue. He was surprised, therefore, that they should sue for such a paltry sum as 958*l.*, particularly in the present state of the country.

Mr. *Estcourt* agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, that this was a paltry proceeding. It was paltry on account of the smallness of the sum voted. It was miserable to think that a country like England should only grant 958*l.* towards the support of her Universities. With respect to the appropriation of College revenues, the hon. Member ought to know they could not be diverted from the purposes for which they were bequeathed.

Mr. *Sheil* observed, that in England, a rich country, the Professors at her Universities were paid by the State, while in Scotland, a poor country, the Professors were paid by the students in the shape of fees; but he rose chiefly to ask, how it was, when such grants were made to the English Universities, the grants to the Dublin Society for its Professorships had been reduced?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he knew, that at Cambridge, fees were paid by the students who attended the lectures, and they were apportioned to the rank of the parties—a Sizar paying the smallest fees. The hon. and learned Member was also mistaken in supposing that the Scotch Universities were wholly maintained by fees, for he had, in his official capacity, recently remitted 800*l.* to the University of St. Andrew's. With respect to the grant made to the Dublin Society, it was found that the State paid everything, and the inhabitants nothing. Ministers were willing to continue the grant upon its being shown by the Dublin public that they were so anxious for these lectures as to be disposed to pay a small part of their expense, and he was happy to say, that such an arrangement was likely to be made.

Mr. *Wilkes* said, his objection to the grant rested upon the facts that the Dissenters, and others who paid taxes, were excluded from the Universities, and that both the King's College and the London Universities supported their Professors by the fees of students, or the liberality of the founders. Besides, he believed, the lectures at Oxford and Cambridge were mere matters of form. He protested against such a grant, which every man attached to religious liberty ought to oppose, until all classes, whether Dissenters or Catholics, had an equal claim on all the benefits of the Universities.

Mr. *Wrangham* said, the hon. Member had opposed the grant on account of an exclusive system being in force at the Universities, and that all classes equally paid the tax; but did the hon. Member who was so much attached to religious liberty, recollect there was such a thing as a grant to Maynooth College, and another in the shape of a *Regium Donum*, to the Presbyterian ministers? He supported the grant upon account of the advantages which resulted to science from such encouragement being held out to Universities in all parts of the empire, and on account of the connexion this established between the State and those learned bodies. When he heard it was paltry for the Universities to come a begging, he said it was a wretched and miserable spirit of retrenchment which would put a stop to such a grant as that before the House.

Mr. *Hume* said, the ground of his opposition to this vote had been mistaken. He did not oppose it because he thought that science received no benefit from it; but he said it was a reproach to those Universities, with their ample funds, to ask the country for this contribution. If he was satisfied that their incomes were not sufficient, he should say nothing, but they had refused all kinds of inquiry into their present condition, and refused to produce their accounts, although it was a principle established with all other societies, that, when they received the public money, they were bound to show their condition, and prove that their income was not equal to their expenditure.

Sir *John Bourke* supported the grant with much pleasure, and he never thought of inquiring into the religious tenets of those who received the money. It was sufficient for him to know it was intended to be applied to the purposes of scientific and moral education.

Sir *Robert Inglis* begged leave, in the few remarks he had to make on this subject, to address them to the hon. member for Middlesex, as he had the reputation of closely examining all money questions that came before the House. He put this grant to him on the score of economy, as the University of Oxford alone contributed to the revenue in the direct shape of Stamps for degrees conferred, more than six times the sum given her for the encouragement of learning. He was ashamed to bring such an argument forward, for he felt the grant could be justified on much higher grounds. He thought the hon. Member's own experience at the London University would have taught him that a considerable sum of money was required by the Professors to furnish materials for experiments. The sciences taught by the Professors, for whose benefit this grant was intended, were not necessarily connected with a University education, and they, therefore, more particularly demanded the support of the public at large.

Mr. *Hume* was glad the hon. Baronet had brought into his recollection the sordid conduct of the University which he represented: the London University established fourteen Professorships, and hoped to obtain a Charter by which they could confer degrees, but the University of Oxford entered its *caveat*, and stopped it, on the ground of its interfering with such emoluments as the hon. Baronet had taken credit for, so that they were determined nobody but themselves should have the advantage of paying Stamp duties. But the utter fallacy of this Stamp argument of the hon. Baronet was apparent. According to his doctrine, every Corporation which admitted freemen and thereby paid Stamp duties, ought to be supported by a grant of public money.

Mr. *Hunt* certainly thought it was a disgrace to such wealthy establishments to claim such a pitiful sum. Besides, he suspected there was some job connected with it, for he observed there was 59*l.* charged as fees upon the 900*l.* Like the hon. Member for Middlesex, he would have made no objection to the grant if the accounts of the Universities had been on the Table, and it could be shown that they had occasion for the money; but, as it was, he was determined to take the sense of the House upon the question.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, the hon. Member did not seem to know the origin of the grant, therefore he would tell him that it was originally granted out of the hereditary revenues of the Crown by the Monarch for the encouragement of science and learning, and when the hereditary revenues were commuted for a sum called the Civil List, the grant necessarily appeared as a Parliamentary allowance, although it was in fact given by the Monarch. It was one item of that bargain from which the public had profited so largely, as he had already explained.

The Committee divided on the vote: Ayes 72; Noes 9—Majority 63.

Vote passed.

13,680*l.* 10*s.* was voted to defray the charges of the Insolvent Debtors' Court.

2,092*l.* 5*s.* was proposed to defray the expenses of the Alien Office.

Mr. *Hume* said, they had no occasion to be afraid of foreigners in the present state of Europe, and he did hope that a Whig and liberal Government would put an end to this expense; there had of late been instances—he alluded to the treatment of a Polish nobleman in Dublin, as stated in the newspapers—where the machinery of this office was disgracefully employed.

Mr. *Spring Rice* assured his hon. friend, that there were applications made to the office quite unconnected with politics, which made it desirable that it should be kept up.

Vote agreed to.

On the Resolution granting 24,287*l.* for the expenses of the Penitentiary at Milbank,

Mr. *Hume* wished to contrast the expenses of this establishment with one in America, in order to show the Committee what a waste of public money took place. In Maryland, there was an institution of this sort, in which 435 persons were confined, which, after paying all its expenses, returned an income to the State of 10,000 dollars. Look at the one, then, before the House, which cost 7,250*l.* per annum in salaries to officers alone. The governor received, besides his half-pay of 136*l.*, a salary of 600*l.*, making 736*l.* for a keeper of convicts. A chaplain had 400*l.*, which was a monstrous amount, even if he did duty three times a day. How many curates were there that performed the duties of large parishes for 150*l.* ? A surgeon had 300*l.* Surgeons in the army, when in full action, did not receive so much. A medical superintendent received 300*l.*, making altogether 600*l.* for medical attendance, which was more than was paid for a regiment, or the largest ship of war. Next came a secretary with 400*l.* a-year, and a steward with 200*l.*, to keep the accounts of this excellent institution, which ought to be managed for a quarter of the sum. A schoolmaster had 100*l.*; he had no very great objections to him, although he could obtain plenty from his own country for half the amount. Next, there was the governor's clerk, who received 150*l.* a-year. Four task-masters 240*l.*, and four assistant task-masters 60*l.*, as if some of the convicts could not be selected for those duties. Twenty wardens were engaged at 50*l.* a-year each, to take care of 600 convicts, in a strong building, surrounded by a high wall, which no one could scale. Then came four infirmary wardens, at 50*l.* a-year, and a baker at 60*l.* He supposed the bakers in the metropolis were so honest, that not one of them was in the Penitentiary as a convict, where he could be employed in his trade. Two cooks at 100*l.* a-year, as if none of the prisoners could cook their own provisions. Two millers at 100*l.* a-year. Then came two messengers at 50*l.* a-year; for the authorities in this place must ape their betters. Next came seven wardens at 50*l.* a-year each, to take care of the females, besides two nurses and another cook. He next came to the manufacturing department, where he found a master manufacturer at 200*l.* a-year, two clerks at 170*l.*, and a warehouseman at 70*l.* What did the House think of that array, when they knew that the experiment which the establishment had intended to try had failed? He thought these items showed that there was a most shameful expenditure of the public money. Each individual confined cost the public 35*l.* a-year. The expense of this establishment exceeded that of any nobleman's in the country. " Sir," said the hon. Gentleman, " why not send these females to our colonies? The colonies want women. I am sure that the ladies in the Penitentiary would be very happy to supply this important deficiency. Send these women out, Sir, to the colonists, and you will confer a great benefit upon all parties."

Mr. *Spring Rice* wished the House to keep the origin of this establishment in recollection. It did not originate with the Government, but was recommended by a Committee of the House, appointed to inquire into the subject, and was under the supervision of the Committee appointed by an Act of Parliament, selected from persons most conversant with the subject. It was utterly impossible to discuss the subject apart from the great question of secondary punishments. He was ready to agree with the hon. Member, that it might be of advantage to give a supply of women to the colonies, but there were difficulties in the way of carrying that measure into effect. Gentlemen complained of the expense of this establishment, but he could assure them that it was conducted as economically as possible, although the establishment was calculated for a larger number of prisoners than was at present within it. The building would contain 1,000 or 1,200 persons. An effort was made to obtain a saving in the article of food, which produced a dreadful malady attended with a great loss of life, and the hon. Member must recollect that it was explained before the Committee that a better quality of food was required for persons in confinement than for those who were at large. As to the array of officers which his hon. friend had enumerated, he would not go through them in detail, but would select one for illustration—the chaplain, who was said by his hon. friend to be so monstrously overpaid. He trusted the Committee would bear in mind, that few clergymen who were well calculated for the office would like it, when their ministry was confined to convicts, and their place of residence a prison.

Mr. *Dixon* said, the case of the chaplain might, perhaps, be defended, but there was a host of other officers apparently useless. He was, therefore, convinced some further inquiry was necessary into the whole management of the establishment.

Mr. *Sheil* said, he did not think the case of the chaplain could be defended. No chaplain to a Gaol in Ireland had more than 120*l.* a-year, although some of them, in Dublin, for instance, had nearly as much work to do as the chaplain to the Penitentiary with 400*l.*

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he had already remarked, that the salaries were calculated on the supposition of the prison being full of convicts, but at present there was not more than 538 persons within the walls, although the building would hold twice that number. Consequently the salaries were too high at present. As to the chaplain in Dublin, he attended the Gaol on Sunday, and once in the course of the week, and for that he received 120*l.*, whereas the chaplain at the Penitentiary was in constant attendance; and when the number of persons each of those gentlemen had to attend was considered, he did not think the proportionate increase of the salary of the one, as compared with the other (supposing the Penitentiary was full), was more than was proper, but he was not attempting to defend the salary of 400*l.* under existing circumstances, because he thought it too great.

Sir *Robert Inglis* observed, that, looking to the amount of duty expected from the chaplain, the close confinement and the constant attention required, together with the exemplary manner in which the present chaplain performed his duties, he could by no means consider him overpaid even with the present number of prisoners.

Sir *Thomas Freemantle* had not expected this vote to come under the consideration of the House, or he should have been better prepared to speak upon it; but, although he was taken by surprise at the question being brought forward, yet he was by no means surprised at the speech of the hon. member for Middlesex, for he had, on a former occasion, made the very same observations. He had resumed his favourite subject, namely, the high salaries of officers. He wished he would be induced to visit this establishment once, and examine what the system in the Penitentiary really was, as he felt quite sure that, if he were acquainted with all the details of the establishment, he would find that there was great labour in carrying the discipline into full effect; and that, expensive as the establishment undoubtedly was, no more was expended than was absolutely necessary. Such an inquiry, he had no doubt, would incline the hon. Member to agree in the opinion expressed by the Committee in favour of the continuance and maintenance of this establishment. That it should be maintained altogether in the manner it now was he did not wish; as it certainly did not altogether answer the purpose for which it was intended, because the establishment was not full, neither was due discrimination used in selecting proper objects for it. Subject to these qualifications, he was prepared to say, that the establishment was an useful one; and he felt assured that, when the Report of the Committee was laid before the House, it would completely bear out what he had said on this subject. The attention of the House, and of the country in general, had lately been particularly directed to the subject of secondary punishments—a subject not inferior in importance to any which had for some years occupied the attention of this House. He believed it was the prevailing opinion that the only mode to be adopted was that of solitary confinement for a short period with hard labour; and there was no way of carrying that into effect without the Penitentiary system. Were this system adopted, he was quite certain that, in the course of twelve months, they should have occasion to build more such places. He was aware that considerable alteration might be beneficially made in the system pursued at the Milbank Penitentiary: solitary confinement had been carried into effect more extensively than was originally contemplated. The classification of the prisoners with reference to that subject had been entirely abolished; the consequence was, that the prisoners were kept strictly in their solitary cells, working by themselves, and only meeting their fellow prisoners in their walks round the yard. With regard to the advantages to be derived by individuals confined in this establishment, it was sufficient to refer to the annual returns, by which it would be ascertained, that, of the number of persons who went out of the establishment, two-thirds turned out well, and were able to bring proper testimonials of their good behaviour, in order to receive the gratuity which was given to those who led correct lives during the first twelve months after their discharge. These gratuities were never given but upon the best evidence of the good character of the party. With respect to the salaries of the officers, undoubtedly they were very high; but when it was considered that they were called upon to devote the whole of their time and attention to this establishment, and the extreme difficulty of keeping 600 or 700, and sometimes 1,000, men in strict discipline, he believed the salaries given, though they might, in some instances, be too high, were not exorbitant, and that it would be impossible to make any great deduction from them. With regard to the gaols of this country, it was quite impossible to institute a comparison between them and this establishment. This was an establishment of a peculiar character, and stood by itself; but he trusted that steps would be taken within the next year for extending the beneficial influence of this establishment rather than of reducing it.

Mr. *Briscoe* begged leave to state, in reply to a suggestion of the hon. member for Middlesex, that nothing could be more unwise than to employ prisoners in any offices in the establishment. The prisoners were sent there to undergo punishment for crimes committed, and to make them superintend others was a mischievous perversion of the object of the establishment.

Mr. *Wilks* considered, that, when the report of the Committee on Secondary Punishments was received, it would be found that this establishment could be made a very important auxiliary in promoting the objects which that Committee had in view.

Mr. *Hume* must repeat, notwithstanding the remark of the hon. member for Surrey, that it would be beneficial to employ the prisoners in menial offices about the prison. He saw an item in the charge of 312*l.* for assistant labourers to clean the yards. He thought the convicts might as well perform that duty, and some of the female convicts might as well perform the office of nurses as to hire persons for that duty.

Mr. *Briscoe* begged to observe, that the hon. Member had not given quite a correct account of the expenditure of the 312*l.*, for the wages of the engineers and other persons were included in that sum as well as that of labourers for cleansing the yards.

Resolution agreed to.

The next item was the sum of 1,462*l.*, in aid of the fee fund for the office of the registry of slaves.

Mr. *Hume* said, this was a new item in the accounts, he had not observed any such charge before.

Mr. *Spring Rice* observed, in reply, that it was no new expense. It was formerly defrayed out of the contingencies of the Colonial Office. He had thought this an objectionable mode, and had, therefore, made it a separate vote. The salary of the Colonial Registrar was 800*l.* He had two clerks and a messenger, with house-rent and other charges; the whole expense was about the sum proposed for the vote.

Mr. *Hume* said, that it really appeared to him to be quite impossible to reduce the expenditure of the country, if a mere clerk was to be paid a salary of 800*l.*

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the Registrar was not a mere clerk: his duties required a considerable portion of legal knowledge.

Vote agreed to, as were votes of 5,400*l.* for the expenses of the State-paper office, the office for the custody of Records in the Tower, and in the Chapter House, Westminster, was agreed to. 66,151*l.* for the charge of retired allowances or superannuations to persons in public offices, or in the public service. 16,000*l.* for the relief of Toulonese and Corsican emigrants, American loyalists, &c., was agreed to. 2,100*l.* for the National Vaccine Establishment. 3,000*l.* for the Society for the Refuge of the Destitute. 3,682*l.* for the support of criminal lunatics; as were 5,150*l.* to Dissenting ministers of Great Britain, poor French refugees, the inhabitants of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, &c. 99,500*l.* for stationery, printing, binding, &c. for both Houses of Parliament, and the various public offices in Great Britain and Ireland. 4,500*l.* to defray extraordinary expenses, incurred in the coinage of gold. 1,000*l.* for the law expenses incurred in prosecuting coiners.

The next sum was 44,325*l.* for secret service money.

Mr. *Hunt* opposed the grant, as being extravagant for such a purpose, under what was called a liberal Administration.

Mr. *Spring Rice* stated, that the grant was small as compared with the grants of former years: in 1825 it was 56,000*l.*, in 1826 it was 49,000*l.*, in 1829, 45,000*l.*, and he wished to inform the House that only 1,000*l.* of the vote were required for Great Britain.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he was not satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, and, by way of experiment, he would move that the vote be reduced one half—say 22,000*l.*

The Committee divided on the Amendment. The numbers were—Ayes 1—Noes 63—Majority 62.

Vote agreed to.

56,000*l.* was proposed for printing the Bills and Reports of both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. *Hume* said, that he must protest against this monopoly, still continued, of a King's printer. He thought it monstrous that the people should be prevented having a knowledge of the Acts of Parliament at a cheap rate; and he conceived that one penny, instead of one shilling and ninepence, ought to be a sufficient charge for each copy of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he was ready to acknowledge that every one should have access to the laws, but the hon. member for Middlesex should recollect that Government was prevented doing any thing in the present matter, waiting the report of the Committee which the hon. Gentleman himself had moved for.

Mr. *Hume* denied that that circumstance should prevent Ministers acting as in the mean time, was evidently necessary.

Mr. *Warburton* supported Mr. Hume's objection, and instanced the fact, that an injunction had lately been obtained by the King's printer against an individual for publishing some Acts at a cheap rate.

Mr. *Hunt* maintained, that the Laws should be circulated as cheaply as possible, and that every person should have a knowledge of the laws under which he lived, and a voice in making them, through his Representatives.

Mr. *Spring Rice*, in explanation, said, that it was absolutely necessary that there should be authorised copies of the laws published.

Sir *Robert Peel* agreed with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that there should be authorised copies, and he suggested that the King's printer should publish cheap copies of the Acts. With reference to what the hon. Gentleman near him (Mr. Hunt) had said, he would ask the hon. Gentleman what he would do with those who were under age, and were, therefore, not entitled to vote for Representatives? At the Old Bailey, for instance, the great majority of the prisoners tried were mere youths; and the hon. member for Preston had next to take the women into account; and, therefore, extensive as his views of Reform were, he must see that, according to the rule which he had laid down, of allowing no prisoners to be tried under laws which they had not had a voice in making, that he would have something still to provide for.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that the right hon. Baronet had objected to the doctrine of the Judges of the land, and not his; for the Judges told the prisoners that they were tried under the laws made by their Representatives. With regard to the infants and the women, the former had their parents to instruct them, and the latter had their husbands for their protection.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, the hon. member's infants at the Old Bailey were of a very dangerous class; and as to the women having husbands, "I (said the right hon. Baronet) spoke of unmarried women."

Mr. *Hunt* replied, that he argued upon the principle that every child in these kingdoms had a father and mother.

Vote agreed to.

The next sum proposed was 18,750*l.* for law charges.

Mr. *Hume* said, he understood there was at the Treasury a Solicitor, with a salary of 2,000*l.* a-year, and an assistant Solicitor, with 1,500*l.* a-year: he saw no occasion for two such officers.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, it was necessary to have an assistant Solicitor, as the attendance of the Solicitor himself could not always be had. Besides, these persons were a sort of standing Council to the Treasury and Home Office. They always conducted the Crown prosecutions. It must also be recollected that both these officers must be men of eminence in their profession, and that they must give up all other employment, and that they had no fees. In the Post Office, the Solicitor was paid by costs, but in all the other public establishments the Solicitors had fixed salaries, which was found, on the whole, the best and most economical mode of conducting the public business.

Vote agreed to, as was

119,860*l.* for the support and employment of convicts at Bermuda. 31,250*l.* for the support of the captured slaves and liberated Africans, in the abolition of the slave trade, and 8,519*l.* for the salaries of Commissioners under the same Acts.

105,638*l.*, 15*s.* was proposed, for the salaries of Consuls, Consuls-General, and Vice-Consuls.

Mr. *Dixon* rose to complain, that a motion which he had given notice of for Thursday night last had been frustrated by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The motion was respecting the claims of British subjects on the Brazilian government; and the noble Lord, not being prepared for the discussion, had contrived that there should be no House. Ministers had placed their emissaries in the lobby of the House to prevent Members from entering; and he himself had been stopped by one of them. There was a charge against the noble Lord for interfering with a despatch to Lord Aberdeen, which would render him amenable to a parliamentary impeachment. He was disgusted with the proceedings of the noble Lord; and he was determined, if Ministers gave him any annoyance, to show them he could annoy them in return.

Viscount *Palmerston* said, the friends of the hon. Member must feel some apprehensions of an approaching delirium. The hon. Member had complained of indisposition, and he would advise him to take physic. The hon. Member quite forgot himself in the importance he attached to himself and his motion, which was viewed with supreme indifference. The Ministry had nothing whatever to do with preventing a House from assembling, and he could assure the hon. member there was a Cabinet Council on that day.

Mr. *Dixon* would repeat, the conduct of the noble Lord was most unworthy. As to the sneer about his indisposition, he treated the noble Lord and his remarks with perfect contempt.

The *Chairman* felt himself obliged to call the hon. Member to order.

Mr. *Hume* said, he could not see the necessity of paying to the Consuls the large sums they at present received, when it was well known that the Vice-Consuls performed the whole duty. He thought that merchants would perform the duties of consulship cheaper and better than others. He had received a letter from the Mauritius, stating that the gentleman who had been appointed Attorney General there was so ignorant of the laws and the language, that the Governor was obliged, by proclamation, to appoint a person to assist him.

Viscount *Palmerston* said, on his accession to office, he had expressed to the South American States his readiness to enter into commercial relations with them. There was no Consul at Lima, from which, no doubt, great inconvenience arose; but he had done all in his power to remedy it, and there was a gentleman already appointed, who would proceed there as soon as possible. He hoped, that the reduction which had been already made in the Colonial Department, to the amount of 29,000*l*., would afford a proof that they were not inattentive to the public interest. As to the appointment of merchants, though that might answer in some instances, yet, from their connections and private interest, they would not be in general the most proper persons.

Vote agreed to.

172,236*l*. were next proposed for the convicts in New South Wales.

Lord *Eliot* wished to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact, that a great expense might be saved by purchasing stores on the spot. He also begged to draw the attention of the Committee to the circumstance that this charge did by no means cover the expenses of the colonies of Van Diemen's Land and New South Wales, on account of the convicts. There were also stores supplied by the Ordnance, which were included in the estimates of that Board, and there were also charges in the Navy Estimates, as incurred by the Navy, Victualling, and Medical Departments.

Mr. *Spring Rice* readily admitted, that the strictures of the noble Lord were justly founded, but there was an improvement in this account over those of former years. He acknowledged it was yet very imperfect, but he hoped next year to bring all the expenditure under one head. With respect to the application of convict labour, also an important alteration was about to be made. Hitherto a very considerable number of convicts had been employed in Government works, which works ought never to have been undertaken. The alteration contemplated was, if any public works were required in future, they were to be done by contract.

Mr. *Dixon* begged to ask the right hon. Gentleman, what control the colonial revenues were under? he heard they amounted to 150,000*l*. a year.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the House had no control over the revenues of New South Wales. They were administered altogether under an Act of Parliament by the colonial government, and that Act was somewhat analogous to the Appropriation Act.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he had great doubts if these revenues were well administered; there were reports of favoritism and patronage connected with apportioning convict labour. He would propose to remedy those evils—that convict labour should be put up to auction; by which means a considerable saving might be made in sending out convicts from this country. The council of New South Wales ought to be narrowly watched. He understood they had already passed a Corn Law and a Tobacco Bill, and they might get into a habit of legislating for their own benefit, if they were not timely checked. He, therefore, did hope the Treasury would not lose sight of them.

Mr. *Hume* wished to be informed, up to what period the accounts from New South Wales had been received? The Governor was drawing for 150,000*l.* a year; and it was trifling with the House not to remit the accounts duly.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, if there was any delay at present, it might be accounted for by a new Governor being appointed, who had yet hardly arrived in the colony. The delay had heretofore arisen in consequence of the grant being in the Army Extraordinaries. This abuse was now, however, remedied, and he hoped the accounts would be quite as regular as those from any other colony, allowing for the great distance.

Resolution agreed to.

10,462*l.* for fees of Officers of Parliament.

19,504*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.* for salaries of Commissioners of Charities.

15,000*l.* for the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the practice of the Superior Courts of Common Law respecting real property.

10,000*l.* to defray the expenses incurred under the direction of the Commissioners of Records, were also voted.

On the question, that 15,700*l.* be paid to the representatives of the late Mr. Shelton, for expenses incurred for contracts and securities relative to the transportation of convicts to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land,

Mr. *Dixon* said, this was a most extraordinary charge, and he begged the right hon. Gentleman would favour the House with some explanation of it.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the late Mr. Shelton had delayed, in an extraordinary manner, for nearly forty years, sending his accounts, as Clerk of Arraigns, concerning the transportation of convicts. A considerable sum had been paid for stamps; and other sums were paid by him which he had never demanded from Government. The account presented by his executors was 22,000*l.* which had been reduced to 15,700*l.*

Mr. Alderman *Wood* said, he must bear his testimony to the probity of Mr. Shelton, with whom he had been many years acquainted. He was a very careless man with regard to money. He had a large income, and his expenses were small; the consequence was, that he did not collect the money owing to him. On his death Bankers' checks, to the amount of several thousand pounds, which had been paid to him, were found scattered about his drawers. A more honourable man never existed, and he was of opinion no deduction ought to have been made from the 22,000*l.* claimed.

Mr. Alderman *Hughes Hughes* begged to confirm every word which had been uttered by his hon. friend. He assured the Committee, after a very careful investigation of the subject, that the public had been great gainers by the accounts not being duly remitted.

Resolution agreed to.

On the next vote, for 5,000*l.* as a compensation to Mr. William Smith Boyd, owner of the ship *Almorah,* in consequence of the seizure of that ship at New South Wales, in 1825, by Captain Mitchell, of the *Slaney,* and at Calcutta, by Captain Bremer, of the *Tamar,*

Mr. *Dixon* said, before this vote was agreed to, he wished to have some explanation respecting it.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the circumstances of the case were shortly these:—In consequence of a scarcity of provisions in the colony of New South Wales in the year 1824, the Governor of the colony engaged the *Almorah* to proceed to procure a supply of provisions. In 1825, this vessel returned, having touched at Manilla, and, in addition to the rice and other provisions, had taken on board twenty-four boxes of specie, and 300 chests of tea, on account of the colony; and the commissary had also taken on board, on his own account, thirty-four chests of tea. If there was anything which could bear the name of smuggling, in connexion with this ship, it was only with reference to the thirty-four chests of tea, and this had been put on board by the Government officer, the commissary of the ship; and the Captain had nothing whatever to do with it. On the arrival of the vessel in the waters of Sidney, she was seized by Captain Mitchell, of his Majesty's ship *Slaney,* on the ground, that the ship had imported this tea into the colony without having a license from the East India Company. Now, if there was any breach of the law, it was with respect to the thirty-four chests of tea which the commissary had embarked; but the officer who made the seizure was not aware of this part of the cargo, but pursued the conduct which he did in consequence of the 300 chests of tea, which were imported by leave of the Governor of the colony. The Governor, as soon as he heard of this seizure, wrote to Captain Mitchell, and stated, that the ship had been employed by him, and that he had authorized the Captain of the *Almorah* to import the tea; he, therefore, gave orders to the Captain of the King's ship, not to proceed, but to give up the vessel. The Governor was not, however, aware of the thirty-four chests of tea being on board the *Almorah.* The Governor then gave orders to the Attorney General of the colony to proceed on board the *Almorah,* and to assure the Captain that he would be a guarantee for the safety of the vessel, and would deposit specie to the amount of the value of the ship and cargo. The Captain, however, was guilty of the most extraordinary conduct; for he would not allow the Attorney General to come on board his vessel, but threatened to fire upon him; and, indeed, refused to hold any intercourse with him, but instantly set sail from the colony to Calcutta. On the arrival of the *Almorah* in the river Hoogley, Captain Bremah came upon the scene. On this latter officer being informed that the *Almorah* had arrived from Sidney with tea on board, he instantly seized the ship. It appeared, however, on inquiry, that Captain Bremah was not authorized in making this seizure; for, although, undoubtedly, the Captain of the *Almorah* had been guilty of an indiscretion and a breach of the law, yet it did not appear that he contemplated a fraud. The proceedings were long carried on in the Admiralty Court at Calcutta, by Captain Bremah, against the owners of this vessel on the one hand, with a view to procure the condemnation of it, and by the owners of the *Almorah* on the other, against Captain Bremah, for an illegal seizure. It was at last mutually agreed between the parties, that all proceedings in these suits should cease on both sides, and that the one party should abandon the seizure, and the other the action to try the legality of it. It appeared that, up to this time, the owners of the *Almorah* had lost no less than 8,000*l.* in the cargo and freight; and, of this sum, 3,000*l.* was due by the Governor of the colony for freight. After the fullest consideration of these circumstances, therefore, it had been thought just, that the sum named in the Resolution should be given to the owners of the *Almorah* as a remuneration. It might be said, that the first wrongdoer in this case was Captain Melville, who, it must be admitted, appeared, according to the statement which he had made, to have acted with considerable indiscretion. It was a question, whether Captain Melville ought not to be made to pay the loss which he had occasioned, and the opinion of the law-officers of the Crown was taken on the subject. He had that day received their reply, and a Minute had passed the Treasury to direct proceedings to be commenced against that officer, in accordance with the opinion. After the most attentive consideration of the case, it had been thought most fair that the owners of this vessel should be paid at once, and that they should not be kept out of their money until the result of the trial could be known.

Mr. *Dixon* said, he was in the colony at the time this seizure was made, and at that time there being a great scarcity, the vessel was sent to procure a cargo of rice; but there was no occasion to import tea. Neither in his opinion had the vessel any business at Manilla, and he understood she had been previously engaged in smuggling tea into the colony. He knew that in Van Diemen's Land in 1825 the only teas imported into that island went by the name of Almorah and Albina, being the names of the vessels in which the teas were imported. He had also heard some circumstances varying from the statement of the right hon. Gentleman relating to the seizure of the vessel at Calcutta. On all these accounts he should like to see all the papers connected with the case.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the papers were extremely voluminous, and it would perhaps be advisable to print only a portion of them, but he should be happy to show the whole to any hon. Member who had a desire to look into the case. After the most attentive consideration, the Treasury had come to the conclusion that the owners of the vessel ought to be paid forthwith, and the country must look to the officers who seized the vessel for repayment, if they had committed any fault.

Mr. *Dixon* said, he had no wish to have the whole of the papers laid on the Table, but there appeared to him something extraordinary in the whole proceedings; he wished very much to know on what grounds the action commenced against Captain Bremah at Calcutta had been compromised.

Mr. *Spring Rice:* It was because Captain Bremah was not justified in acting as he did, although it was clear that the Captain of the *Almorah* had been guilty of an irregularity which made it extremely improbable that the owners of the vessel could have obtained a decision against the naval officer. The terms of the compromise were, that Captain Bremah should give up the vessel, and that the owners of it should abandon their action against him. The law officers of the Crown, however, had recommended that proceedings should be instituted against Captain Melville, as there was a sufficient case to go before a Jury, and it was thought better that the proceedings should be instituted by the Government than by the owners of the vessel, as the ship had been hired by the Governor of the colony.

Sir *George Clerk* was aware of some of the circumstances connected with this case, and the papers certainly were extremely voluminous. He understood that the question of the legality of the seizure by Captain Melville was also to have been tried at Calcutta. As for the compromise that was entered into between Captain Bremah and the owners of the vessel, he thought all the particulars relating to it ought to be laid upon the Table before a a shilling of the public money was voted to remunerate the owners of the vessel for the loss they had sustained. Indeed, even in justice to the Captain of the *Slaney*, he did not think that the House should be called upon to decide the case until the whole of the papers had been laid on the Table. If Captain Melville acted illegally, of course he was responsible for his conduct, and an action could be brought against him for the recovery of the loss the owners of the vessel might have sustained. He thought, moreover, that the proceedings for this purpose ought to be carried on by the owners of the vessel, and not by the Government. If the officer of a King's ship through carelessness, did any damage to a merchant vessel, he was liable to be proceeded against for the recovery of damages; but the Government never advanced the money and brought the action. He saw no reason why an exception should be made in favour of the owners of the *Almorah*.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, as the ship was in the employ of the Colonial Government of New South Wales at the time the seizure took place, the circumstances of the case were different from the case put by the right hon. Baronet. He thought it would be extremely hard upon the owners of the ship after they had been kept out of their money since 1824, to wait for remuneration until the action was decided. It should be remembered that the larger portion of the money claimed was for the freight of the vessel. There could be no doubt, that an act was committed under the British flag against the laws of the colony, and, that the owners of the *Almorah* had to complain of being illegally treated. Surely, therefore, they ought not to be longer kept out of the money due for the freight of their ship. The Governor of the colony might not have acted properly in having 300 chests of tea shipped in the way previously described; but that furnishe d no reason for seizing the vessel, for it must be understood the thirty-four chests of tea embarked by the Commissary had been taken no account of by those who made the seizure.

Mr. *Hume* felt much surprised, that the owners of the vessel had not commenced legal proceedings against Captain Melville in the lapse of eight years since the transaction had taken place. The conduct of that officer had been most extraordinary, and it ought to have been noticed by the Admiralty.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, proceedings had been going on for the last six years, but no decision had hitherto been given

Mr. *Courtenay* did not think the House would be justified in voting the sum of 5,000*l.* for this purpose without being put into possession of the facts of the case; he thought a selection might be made of the papers, and those placed on the Table best calculated to elucidate it.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, if hon. Members wished the vote postponed until the papers were presented, he should offer no opposition to such a course, but it was clear whoever was in the wrong the freight of the vessel must be paid.

Mr. *Warburton* said, if the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was correct, of which he entertained no doubt, the case of the owners appeared an extremely hard one. If papers were thought necessary to explain the case, he thought a summary might be drawn up with marginal notes and reference to documents, but he had no objection to pass the vote at once, relying upon his right hon. friend's correctness.

Sir *Thomas Freemantle* said, as it was clear that the owners of the vessel had sustained a heavy loss from no fault of their own, he would rather vote the money at once. In a case like the present it was necessary in his opinion, that every confidence should be placed in the Government.

Sir *Robert Inglis:* The proposal of the honourable member for Bridport, to have a summary drawn up by the order of Government was in his mind very objectionable. If papers were to be relied on undoubtedly they ought to consist of the original documents.

Mr. *Spring Rice* had no wish to press this vote, if hon. Gentlemen thought further information necessary. If any hon. Member would call at the Treasury, and select such papers as he deemed necessary, he could assure him that he should have ready access to them. Of course, in a matter where personal character was involved—and especially the character of a King's officer, as it was in this case—every possible information should be furnished.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he should certainly take the sense of the Committee on the vote.

Vote postponed.

15,716*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.* for the claims of St. Domingo sufferers; and 55,139*l.* 0*s.* 9*d.* for the expenses of the pay of commissariat officers, compensations, retired allowances, widows' pensions, and compassionate list were voted.

The House resumed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, April 16, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Duke of WELLINGTON, from the Protestants of the Wardenship of Galway, praying to be heard by Counsel against the Indemnity Bill:—By Lord CLONCURRY, from the Corporation of the City of London, for an Alteration in the existing Laws relating to the Oaths of Supremacy and Abjuration:—By the Earl of DARNLEY, from the Inhabitants of Rochester; and by Lord DURHAM, from South Shields, to take the case of that Town into consideration on the Question of Reform; from the Inhabitants of Stockton-on-Tees, and from the Operative Cotton Spinners of Glasgow, in favour of the Bill for Limiting the Hours of Employment of Children in Factories:—By the Earl of FINGAL, from the Inhabitants of Cruizetown:—By Viscount CLIFDEN, from the Inhabitants of Kiltinell and Clonegoose, Graig, Ullard, and Powerstown; and by Lord CLONCURRY, from the Inhabitants of Celbridge and Dromiken, for the Abolition of Tithes and Church Rates in Ireland:—By Lord TEMPLEMORE, from the Inhabitants of Enniscorthy, and Temple Shannon, for the Repeal of the Vestry Act; and from the Inhabitants of Killag and Kilmannon for a similar measure of Reform to be given to Ireland as that intended for England:—By Lord DURHAM, from the Members of the Council of the Political Union of Bethnal Green; and by the Earl of RADNOR, from the Pressis of the Bannockburn Political Union, in favour of Reform:—By Lord CLONCURRY, from the Corporation of London, in favour of the New System of Education intended for Ireland:—By the Duke of GORDON, from the Provincial Synod of Aberdeen. By the Bishop of LINCOLN, from the Clergy and Laity of Louth, Horncastle, Spilsby, and Alford. By the Earl of MANSFIELD, from the Inhabitants of Torquay; and from the Minister, Elders, and Inhabitants of Tillicoultry. By the Bishop of EXETER, from 9,000 Inhabitants of the County of Devon. By the Bishop of BATH and WELLS, from the Inhabitants of Taunton; and by the Duke of BUCCLEUGH, from the Presbytery of Lochmaben, against the proposed System of Education for Ireland:—By Viscount STRANGFORD, from the Inhabitants of Gravesend and Milton; and by the Marquis of SALISBURY, from the Shipowners, Masters, and Pilots of Greenwich, Blackwall, Limehouse, and the Pool, against the Gravesend Pier Bill:—By the Earl of DARNLEY, from the Inhabitants of Gravesend and Milton, Chatham and Rochester; of Persons in the Metropolis engaged in Mercantile and Shipping Concerns, and of Operatives of the Metropolis, in favour of the Bill.

EDUCATION (IRELAND).] Lord *Kenyon* presented a Petition against the new system of Education, from the clergy, gentry, merchants, and inhabitants, of Manchester. It was signed, his Lordship said, by the borough-reeve and municipal Magistrates, by all the clergymen of the town with only two or three exceptions, and by all the Dissenting ministers, and, in a very short space of time, by 4,000 of the most respectable inhabitants, and it would, there was no doubt, have received the signatures of a much greater number had the usual means been resorted to. The petitioners condemned the conduct of Government in attempting to overthrow an established system of education, which had produced consequences the most beneficial and satisfactory on no other grounds than that the Catholic priests objected to it. They expressed also an opinion, that, to appropriate the revenues of the State to the establishment of a system of education from which the Holy Scriptures were to be withdrawn, was inconsistent in the Government of a Protestant King. In this sentiment he entirely concurred. He had always been a great advocate for education, but he considered it essential that it should be founded on the Word of God. He hoped Ministers would not persevere in their plan.

Lord *Suffield* said, the object of his rising was, to explain to their Lordships the character of the meeting from which this petition emanated. He by no means wished to complain of meetings being held on this subject; but he objected to this petition being received as the petition of the gentry, clergy, merchants, and inhabitants of Manchester, when the meeting at which it was agreed to was a packed meeting, to which admission could only be had by a ticket previously obtained. He had received information from a highly respectable individual who attended it, that, soon after the business began, he proceeded to address the meeting, when he was stopped by the Chairman, who called upon him to state whether he agreed in opinion with those who had called the meeting, because, if he did not, he could not be permitted to be heard. Their Lordships were told of the unanimity which prevailed at the meetings where these petitions against the proposed system of education were agreed to. That unanimity was sufficiently accounted for, if no person was permitted to offer his sentiments in opposition to the opinions of those who had called the meeting. He was informed, that there were not more than 200 persons present at the meeting, and that out of that number 120 were females. He did not wish to detract from the merits of the ladies, who no doubt were always busy in the performance of good works; they had been exceedingly active in obtaining signatures to the petition. His noble friend said, that this petition was signed by more than 4,000 persons. The wonder was, not that it was signed by so many, but that it was not signed by 14,000, or even 40,000 persons; for he would say, that, if the petition had been sent to him with such an invitation as that which was put forth at Manchester, he should have signed it directly, and, connected as he was with the town of Manchester, he really was surprised that the petition had not been sent to him for that purpose. There was not a noble Lord on that side of the House who would have refused to sign it on the invitation put forth which commmenced thus:—'All who 'regard the Holy Scriptures as the birth-'right of every Christian; all who be-'lieve them designed to make men wise 'unto salvation; all who conscientiously 'deny the right of man to interfere be-'twixt his fellow-man and a full and perfect 'knowledge of the will of God; all who are 'earnest in contending for these great 'Protestant principles, on behalf of them-'selves and their children; all who desire 'them to be applied and extended for the 'benefit of their brethren in Ireland, are 'invited to come forward and sign this pe-'tition.' Who could hesitate to subscribe to such a declaration as that? But then came that which, he scrupled not to say, was a false assumption. It prayed Government to revise or relinquish a measure, by which the whole and individual Word of God is to be excluded from the schools of national education in that country. The Government system of education for Ireland was calculated, according to the assertion, to exclude the use of the Holy Scriptures. How any persons, pretending to be in possession of common sense could make such an assertion, appeared to him wholly incomprehensible. He had had too much experience of public life, even within his limited sphere of observation, not to know that party feeling frequently led men, under its influence, into the greatest imaginable absurdities, and that they were now and then induced to make assertions, which their calmer judgments altogether repudiated; but of all the gross and outrageous assertions that ever party spirit betrayed men into uttering, this assertion stood out in unequalled absurdity. The more he reflected upon the system of education proposed to be established in Ireland, the more did he become convinced that it was not only the best suited to that country, but that it was, at the same time, the system of education best calculated to secure to the pupils for whose use it had been devised, a sound acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures. He was quite sure that his noble friend, in making the statement which the House had just heard, did so with perfect good faith, and he was anxious merely to rebut his statement, because he imagined that his noble friend might not know what sort of meeting it was at which the petition originated.

Lord *Kenyon* said, his noble friend had told their Lordships that he was never surprised at the length to which party spirit carried those who were under its influence. He trusted that he was not one of its votaries. He considered himself as free as most people from the influence of party feeling, and he hoped he had never been carried away by any other cause than the cause of his country, truth, and religion. He acknowledged his warm attachment to all that could promote truth and justice, and he, therefore, hoped, that his noble friend did not mean to impute to him any influence arising from considerations of party. He must be allowed to say, with respect to this petition, that it had been rather hardly dealt with by the noble Lord. It was a petition not hawked about with bands of music, or any display of colours as some others were, but it was an address from a Protestant population, and its object was, to display a Christian and Protestant feeling, and to procure for the people of Ireland, the use of the Holy Scriptures unmutilated. He should, certainly, have been happy if the petition had been signed by more persons, but it was with much satisfaction he found the signatures as numerous as they actually were. It had been objected to the meeting that it was in some degree a private s embly, it never professed to be any other, n d he much commended the prudence of h ose who, upon such an occasion, avoided public disputation. They were in a town which contained many thousand Catholics, and if they had not adopted precautions, a disturbance might have ensued, and the petitioners been exposed to outrage and insult. Whatever was the character of the meeting, the petition must be considered as that of those who had signed it, among whom was the great body of the clergy of Manchester.

Petition to lie on the Table.

AFFRAY AT NEWTOWNBARRY—CAPTAIN GRAHAM.] The Earl of *Wicklow* rose to bring forward the motion of which he had given notice, with great regret, as he might be supposed to stand in the situation of a public accuser. He did not mean to place himself in that situation, but the imputation of doing so might attach to him, and there was also other imputations against which he felt it necessary to guard himself at the outset. It might be supposed that he intended, upon the present occasion, to make a general attack upon the policy of the Irish Government, and to take this opportunity of venting his hostility against the Administration to which he was opposed. Both these intentions he disclaimed, and, with respect to the first, he would show that it was unfounded, by avoiding all topics that were not immediately connected with the subject before them; and, as to the government of the noble Marquis, he begged to assure their Lordships that he entertained for him feelings of high respect, and was convinced that he entered upon the Irish Government with a deep anxiety to promote the welfare of that country, and that he had never been actuated by any other motive: at the same time, there was much that he disapproved—much of what appeared to him bad policy in the conduct of the Irish Government. The noble Lords opposite, had pursued the system while in office which, when out of office, they had always recommended to all former Governments, and held out as the most favourable to the welfare of the country. But now, after so long an experience of the evils which arose from their system of conciliation, it might have been expected that their eyes would have been opened, and that they would have corrected their policy. While attempting to avoid the errors of former Governments they had gone to the opposite extreme, verifying the remark of the poet, *Dum vitant stulti vitia in contraria currunt.* It would be recollected that it had been attempted by himself and others to draw the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, whose absence upon the present occasion he regretted, into explanations of the transactions relating to Captain Graham. It was true, the noble and learned Lord said, that he would withhold his explanation, as a notice of a motion on the subject had been given by a noble friend of his; and then, when his noble friend had set him right, and said that he had withdrawn his notice, the noble and learned Lord said, "Oh! in that case, as there is no motion intended, there is no occasion for me to say any thing about it." On one occasion the noble and learned Lord had risen apparently for the purpose of giving an explanation of the proceedings of Government, when, unfortunately, a noble Marquis called him to order. The noble Marquis, however, immediately withdrew his objection, and all the noble Lords on that side of the House loudly called upon the noble and learned Lord to proceed, but, notwithstanding this, the noble and learned Lord had thought better of it, and positively refused to proceed. This was the course pursued by the noble and learned Lord when it was attempted to get out of him an explanation for which all the country panted. It had been truly said, on a former discussion of the affairs of Ireland, that it was not so much a great military force which that country required as an efficient Magistracy. This sentiment was expressed by the noble Duke (Wellington), and he was glad to hear it loudly re-echoed by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government. But when he said it was the duty of Government to support the Magistracy, he did not mean to contend that they ought to be supported in illegal or arbitrary acts, but only that the Government should show them some degree of favour; that they should not, at least, judge of their conduct with severity, and manifest a disposition to condemn it; that they should not sacrifice them for little faults, to which it must be expected that country gentlemen should be liable; that, above all, they should not sacrifice them for the sake of obtaining a transitory, unworthy, and degrading popularity. If the character or interests only of an individual Magistrate were at stake, the case would then have a strong claim to the attention and to the justice of that House; but this sunk into nothing, in comparison with a case in which the interests of the whole of

Ireland were concerned. The case of Captain Graham had had a powerful influence upon all the Magistrates of the country. He knew that the Magistracy were paralyzed he knew that they were alarmed, and that they felt they were now liable, upon any slight occasion, to be thrown over by the Government to the power and mercy of the democratic party in that country. In order to show that this was the fact, he would read an extract from the evidence given by the Archbishop of Dublin before the Tithe Committee. It would be recollected that the Archbishop of Dublin had received his appointment from the present Government. He was asked if he knew of any instance in which the Magistrates had been deterred from doing their duty from fear of popular clamour? He replied, "Many. One Magistrate had said, upon one occasion, that he would not put his head into the fire." And he mentioned others who had been deterred, by the apprehension of clamour, from doing their duty efficiently. In allusion to the affair of Knocktopher, he said it was not that the force was insufficient, but that the troops had been deterred from firing till the rioters had seized their muskets, and wrested them from their hands. This evidence with respect to the massacre of Knocktopher, was enough to show that this unfortunate occurrence had been produced by the conduct of Government towards Captain Graham in the affair of Newtownbarry. The first case he should come to was that of Newtownbarry, and, having disposed of that, he should next endeavour to ascertain what were the causes which made the Government angry with the persons who took an active part in suppressing the riots there; but, in the first instance, he should briefly point out to their Lordships the state of the country previous to those riots, The accounts which had reached the Government from various quarters were so alarming as to induce the Lord Lieutenant to issue instructions to the whole of the Magistracy, pointing out to them how they were to act, and promising them countenance and support. He well remembered the circular issued in the autumn of 1830, and one, he must say, which, at the time, afforded him great pleasure, because, whilst it intimated to the Magistrates that, as they would incur the displeasure of the Government for any neglect of duty, so, on the other hand, the Government pledged itself to do its duty in protecting the civil authority. That circular afforded great consolation to him and to all well-disposed persons, and was shortly after followed by another, in which the Magistrates were called upon, not only to disperse rioters, but to take steps to prevent riots, and in which minute instructions were given as to the manner in which the Riot Act was to be read and enforced. It was clear, then, that the Government at that time felt that the peace of the country was endangered, nay, absolutely outraged. He would not trouble their Lordships with the whole of that circular, but he must call their attention to its concluding paragraph. The letter was signed by Mr. Stanley, and was directed "to the Magistrates assembled in petty sessions"—it concluded in these words:—'I am directed, in conclusion, to 'assure you, that, while his Excellency will 'not fail to visit with his severest dis'pleasure any Magistrate who may shrink 'from the due performance of functions so 'vitally important, so, on the other hand, 'your efforts for the suppression of acts of 'outrage or illegality will be duly appre'ciated and acknowledged. The Govern'ment will perform their part, affording 'you the fullest protection in the respon'sible exercise of your authority, and in 'supporting the civil force whenever it 'may be necessary for the preservation of 'the public peace.' This paragraph was very consolatory to the Magistrates. But this was not enough; another circular was sent, encouraging and directing the Magistrates, in which he found the following passage:—'You will further observe, that 'the Magistrates are authorized to prevent, 'as well as suppress, tumultuous meetings, 'and, therefore, when a riot, or breach of 'the peace, is likely to be caused by such 'a meeting, they are authorized, and it is 'their duty, to desire the parties to disperse 'or desist, and, in case of their refusal to 'arrest them, in order to prevent such 'breach of the peace.' The letter then went on to say, that the authority which gave the Magistrates these powers did not take away from them those powers which they previously possessed; and the passage concluded by saying that,—'If the 'persons so assembled, or any of them, 'shall happen to be killed, maimed, or hurt, 'in the dispersing, seizing, or apprehend'ing, or endeavouring to disperse, seize, 'or apprehend them, then every such 'Magistrate, and all persons aiding or 'assisting, shall be indemnified.' Having now called their Lordships' attention to the state of the country and the instructions issued to the Magistrates, he would proceed to refer to the affray at Newtownbarry. Captain Graham, who was the senior Magistrate of the place, and three or four of his brother Magistrates, received information, on the 16th June that a distress for tithes was to be levied on the 18th of the same month upon the goods of a wealthy farmer of the name of Doyle, and they also ascertained that the people were determined to resist the distress, and that a large concourse of people would be assembled for the occasion. They immediately took the best precautions in their power, and collected as many as they could of the police, whom they placed under the command of Captain King, an officer of the police, who had also considerable experience as a military man, and who was known to be competent and trustworthy. In addition to information which the Magistrates had previously received, they, on the evening of the 17th, heard, from a gentleman who had just arrived from Dublin that the adjoining parishes were placarded with notices of the intended meeting, and that crowds were likely to come from a distance for the purpose of being present at the riot, for such was certainly contemplated. Some of the placards were stuck up in the parish of Baltinglass, a distance of fourteen miles from Newtownbarry, as well as on the road the whole way from Baltinglass to Blessington. It then became necessary for the Magistrates to decide upon the best course to be pursued. The nearest military force was at Wexford, a distance of thirty miles; and if an application could have been made in that quarter, it was well known to the Magistrates that the officer there had no greater disposable force than about thirty or forty men, even if there had been time for them to arrive at the scene of the contemplated riots. No resource was then left but the Yeomanry, as it was well known that the police were insufficient. The Yeomanry were sent for, but the notice was so short that only 110 could be collected, and, having marched into the town, they were, in order to prevent all excitement, placed by Captain Graham in a close yard. About twelve o'clock on the 18th a person called upon Captain Graham and informed him that the cattle had been driven away. He, with the police force at his disposal, immediately followed them, retook the cattle, and had them driven back, during which proceeding he was frequently insulted, though not absolutely attacked. Captain King called upon Captain Graham for additional aid, and the latter gentleman seeing that the party under Captain King could not execute their duty, went back to the town for the Yeomanry force, which he had in readiness there, and returned with it to the scene of the disturbance. The attack then commenced on the part of the peasantry. From the evidence given at the trial it appeared that the Yeomanry were not only insulted by the grossest language but were assailed by vollies of stones, and fired at, in consequence of which, some of the party were wounded. Captain Graham seeing the situation in which his men were placed, and being a military man, took up what he considered the most favourable position under the circumstances, by placing the cattle in front, under the protection of the Police, and bringing up the rear with the Yeomanry. In the course of their march, the Yeomanry were constantly exposed to the attacks of the peasantry, and were at length obliged to fire (which they did without orders) in their own defence: the consequence was, an unfortunate loss of life. The cattle were finally taken into the town, and thus ended the unfortunate affair of Newtownbarry. This affair caused a great sensation in that part of the country, and the Radical party in Wexford made strong remonstrances to the Government against the conduct of the Magistrates and Yeomanry. The Government acted with the utmost propriety on the occasion. They admitted the affair was most lamentable, but they said, it would ill become them to adopt measures against the supposed guilty parties, who were amenable to the laws of their country. The Government further stated, that the persons concerned in the transactions should be put upon their trials at the next Assizes: consequently, at the ensuing Assizes eighteen bills of indictment were preferred, which the Grand Jury ignored, and, by their verdict, pronounced that the Magistrates and Yeomanry had only done their duty. Thus stood the case up to that moment, and he would ask, what was there in all this to excite the anger of the Government? Its cause of displeasure must have been founded upon one of three grounds; first, that the calling out of the Yeomanry was wrong, they being an improper force to employ on such occasions; or next, that if the Magistrates had a right to call out the Yeomanry, that was not an occasion in which it was necessary; or thirdly, that the Magistrates had not acted with judgment, prudence, and discretion in their official capacities. With respect to the first of these points, namely, the propriety of calling out the Yeomanry under any circumstances, He could refer their Lordships to the high authority of the Judge who presided at the trial, which arose out of the affair of Newtownbarry, at the last Assizes at Wexford. The learned Judge said—

> "I have not the least hesitation in saying that the Magistrates did nothing more than their duty in calling out the police under these circumstances, and that they were further justified in calling also on the Yeomanry to be ready in case their services should be required."

He said, in his address to the Grand Jury—

> "When Yeomanry are called upon to assist the Magistrates in preserving the peace, the circumstance of their being Yeomanry imposes upon them no peculiar obligation, neither does it clothe them with any peculiar protection. In such a case, they act not as Yeomanry, but as citizens, who are called upon to lend their assistance to maintain the authority of the laws. Persons who are called upon to suppress a riot, may take with them such arms as may appear necessary to enable them to suppress it."

This was the law as laid down by a most able Judge; and, if the Magistrates of that country, acting under such authority, had erred in the execution of their duty, their fault should surely be attributed to an error of judgment, for which no punishment ought to be inflicted on them; or, at all events, that punishment should be very lenient. He could show, however, that Government, so far from condemning the employment of Yeomanry, authorized Magistrates to avail themselves of the services of that force. It so happened, that a similar occurrence to that which occurred at Newtownbarry, had taken place, a short time before, at a place situated in an adjoining county. He alluded to the case of Captain Feltus, in the county of Carlow, who had actually received the thanks of the Government for an act precisely similar to that for which Captain Graham was dismissed; for dismissal he would call it, though the noble Lord, the Chancellor for Ireland, said, that Captain Graham was not dismissed, but that he was not reinstated. The Magistrates, upon that occasion, called out the Yeomanry, and succeeded, by means of that force, in preventing a riot. He would not trouble the House with reading the instructions from the Secretary of Ireland on that subject; but he would refer to another occasion still prior to the affair of Newtownbarry, in which resistance to the payment of tithes was displayed; for, unfortunately, resistance to the law was, at that time, spreading over the whole of the country, embarrassing the Magistrates, and terrifying the loyal and peaceable portion of the community. The circumstance to which he alluded took place at Ardmire in the same county. The Magistrates, on that occasion, had time to consider what measures they should adopt, and they, therefore, deputed one of their body, Captain Owen, to ascertain from Mr. Stanley whether, in case of necessity, the Magistrates might call out the Yeomanry? The extract which he would now read, would put their Lordships in possession of the result of the conversation which took place between this Gentleman and Mr. Stanley, as detailed in a letter from Captain Owen to Captain Graham:—

> "Dear Sir—In reply to your letter, I can only give you the purport of the conversation I had with Mr. Stanley, in February last, in the presence of Captain Gossett, when I went up, on the part of my brother Magistrates in this neighbourhood, to apply for military aid, to put a stop to an illegal meeting which was about to be held near Gorey. There not being any soldiers quartered near enough to reach us in time, Mr. Stanley asked me, were there not Yeomanry, and why were they not called out? A good deal of conversation ensued, but my impression was, and still is, that at that time if we had, as Magistrates, thought fit to call out the Yeomanry, we should have been acting with the complete sanction of Government."

The date of that letter was September the 4th, 1831. He would next read a letter written by the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, in answer to one addressed to him by the rev. Henry Moore, of Carnew, near Newtownbarry, with the view of ascertaining whether, in the event of riot arising from resistance to the payment of tithe, the Magistrates would be justified in calling out the Yeomanry? The letter was as follows:—

> "*Dublin Castle, January* 10, 1831.
>
> "Sir—I have to acknowledge your letter of the 7th instant, but cannot take upon me to do more than recommend to your attention the line laid down in the circular which I had the honour to address, some days ago, to the magistracy of Ireland. It is for them to decide upon the peculiar circumstances of each individual case, as it occurs. No Government can do more than point out the general principles upon which their decision should be

ormed. As, however, you state that 'there s a sufficient body of loyal Yeomanry in your part of the county to prevent aggression, and preserve the public peace, if the Magistrates should be empowered to call upon them,' you are certainly empowered by law to call on all persons to aid and assist in preserving the public peace; but, perhaps, the safest course to pursue would be, to swear, as special constables, such of the Yeomanry as you can confidently rely upon, and call upon them for their exertions in that capacity, should the ordinary civil force be insufficient to prevent outrage and disturbance, or to disperse any meeting clearly illegal, upon the requisition of the Magistrates. I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,

"E. G STANLEY.

"Rev. Mr. Moore, Carnew."

He thought he heard a cheer when he read that part of the letter which stated, that the Magistrates might swear in the Yeomanry as special constables. If the noble Lords opposite wished to take advantage of that expression, he would give them all the benefit which they could derive from it. Those noble Lords, probably, would be ingenious enough to show the difference between employing Yeomanry in the ranks of the police and as a separate body. His understanding, however, was not astute enough to see that this circumstance made the slightest difference. He thought he had now proved that the Magistrates were sanctioned by the law, and by the wishes of Government, in employing the Yeomanry if necessary. The next point was, to ascertain whether the Magistrates acted wisely in having recourse to this force upon that occasion. It must be recollected, that there was no military force within reach; that, on two previous occasions of a similar nature, the Yeomanry had been called out; and that, on one of these occasions, the persons calling them out had received the thanks of the Government—further, the circumstances attending this particular case must be recollected. The Magistrates had received information that vast multitudes were to assemble to resist the law, and preparations for this purpose were observed going on at fourteen miles' distance from the scene of action. If any man would say that, under these circumstances, the Magistrates were not justified in putting into requisition all the force which they had at their disposal, he must form a widely different opinion of the manner of dealing with riots in Ireland from that which he, and most Irish Magistrates, entertained. He thought he might venture to assume, that he had established two points; first, that it was legal for Magistrates to call out the Yeomanry; and, secondly, that this was an occasion which justified them in having recourse to that force. He would next proceed to show, that the Magistrates acted wisely and prudently in this transaction, and ought to have received the same degree of approbation which Government extended to others under similar circumstances. Though he was unwilling to trouble their Lordships with extracts, he felt that it was absolutely necessary, upon this point, to call their attention to circumstances which transpired at the trial that took place at the last Assizes at Wexford. The evidence of Mr. Ralph, (Mr. M'Clintock's agent), was very important. That gentleman deposed that Captain Graham and his party were pelted with stones of a very large size—that the mob made use of the most insulting and irritating language towards the Yeomanry—and that Captain Graham warned the people that the muskets of the Yeomanry were loaded with ball-cartridges. He would next refer to the evidence of Dr. Hyde, to which he particularly requested the attention of their Lordships, on account of circumstances to which he would allude presently. Dr. Hyde deposed, that the Police and the Yeomanry were exposed to a fierce attack from the people. He described the stones which the mob threw, as forming from their numbers in descending, a perfect arch. Many of the police were hurt by them. He stated that three shots were fired by the crowd, and that he attended one of the Yeomanry who was wounded in the heel. This evidence completely disproved the assertion that the people had no fire-arms. It appeared that two of the Yeomanry were actually wounded, before they commenced firing in their own defence. It was sworn by one or two witnesses, who were brought forward by the prosecution, that Captain Graham gave orders to the Yeomanry to fire, but this evidence was most decidedly contradicted by other witnesses. In the first place it was shown, that the witnesses who deposed to the fact of Captain Graham having ordered his men to fire, were persons of infamous characters. But further than this, men who were in the ranks, deposed, that the words used by Captain Graham were "fie fie," which were addressed to the men to make them cease firing, instead of "fire, fire." The result of the evidence adduced at the trial, went most fully to prove, that Captain Graham, in the execution of the difficult duty he was called upon to perform, acted with sound judgment and discretion, and in a manner which, in his (the Earl of Wicklow's) opinion, did him infinite credit. He would, however, read the opinion of a person whose authority on this point was much higher than his own, that of the learned Judge before whom the trial took place, who said, "You are not now trying Captain Graham, but, after it has been his fortune to have been indicted for the same alleged murder before two successive Grand Juries, and his name called so much in question, it may not be improper to declare to you that, if you believe the witnesses brought forward for the defence, he appears to have conducted himself throughout not merely with a high sense of magisterial duty, but with prudence, moderation, and humanity." When he reflected that Captain Graham had obtained the sympathy of his countrymen—that he had received an approving address from fifty-five Magistrates of the county of which he was himself a Magistrate—that he had been twice instantaneously acquitted by grand juries, and that his conduct had called forth from a Judge of the land the expressions of approbation which he had just read, that Gentleman notwithstanding, the anger of Government had reason to be proud of his situation. In the first instance, the Government certainly acted correctly in refusing to yield to the clamour which was raised against Captain Graham; but subsequently to the trial, and when it was supposed that the affair was at an end, the factious demagogues of Ireland had goaded on the Government to adopt some measures against the magistrates of Wexford. The Government was no longer able to resist the force which burst upon them in August; the Secretary for Ireland, by the desire of the Lord Lieutenant, wrote a letter of censure to the Magistrates of Wexford for their conduct in the Newtownbarry affair. The Magistrates replied, as became them, by sending in their immediate resignation; upon which the following letter was instantly addressed to Mr. Davenzy, one of their body:—

"*Dublin, August* 19, 1831.

"Sir—I have had the honour to lay before the Lord Lieutenant the letter of the 12th instant, desiring, in consequence of the censure, as you are pleased to express it, which his Excellency conveyed by my letter of the 7th instant, to be relieved from the Commissions of the peace for the counties of Carlow and Wexford. His Excellency, in giving effect to your wishes, cannot refrain from expressing his surprise that you should have considered an intimation of his opinion on the impolicy of the measure adverted to in that letter as amounting to so severe an animadversion as to justify, in your opinion, so strong a declaration of feeling as the resignation of your commissions. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your most obedient and humble servant,

"J. Davenzy, Esq. W. Gossett."

He was astonished that the Lord Lieutenant should express any surprise that Magistrates who had been twice virtually acquitted in the face of their country, should feel indignant at receiving a letter of censure from the Irish government. So far from taking the same view of this subject as his Excellency did, he should have considered these gentlemen unworthy of sitting on the bench, if they had not acted precisely as they did. There were reasons which prevented Captain Graham from resigning at the same time as his brother Magistrates. Captain Graham was the agent in several counties, for a most respectable nobleman, whose absence, on the present occasion, no one had so much reason to regret as himself, because he would have performed the duty which he had undertaken much more ably than he could pretend to do. Captain Graham, feeling that he could not effectually perform his duties as agent to Lord Farnham, did not feel himself justified in resigning his commission; but, shortly afterwards, his Excellency, the Lord Lieutenant, withdrew Captain Graham's name from the commission of the peace. Their Lordships must recollect that the Lord Lieutenant expressed his surprise that the other Magistrates should have felt it necessary to send in their resignations, and yet he had deprived Captain Graham of his commission. Why he made any distinction between their case and that of Captain Graham he had yet to learn. The Magistrates were all engaged in the same transaction—they co-operated together in the discharge of their duty; and no difference of opinion prevailed amongst them. When he proposed a question to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland upon this subject, he seemed to draw a distinction between the dismissal of a Magistrate and the omitting to insert his name in the commission. He gave the noble and learned Lords all the benefit which he could derive from the distinction. It might be said, perhaps, that the omission of Captain Graham's name was the act of the Lord Lieutenant of the county, who, under the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland's Act, was called upon to revise the Magistracy—and not the act of the Government. This, though not stated, was in some degree implied in what fell from the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In order to remove all doubt upon that point, however, and to show how the matter really stood, he would trouble the House with some further correspondence. Captain Graham wrote a letter to Mr. Carew, the Lord Lieutenant of the county of Wexford, to the following effect:

"*Newtownbarry, December* 31, 1831.

"Sir—Finding that circular letters have been addressed by you to the Magistrates of the county, and not having myself been honoured with one, I am in doubt whether or not I am authorised in continuing to act as a Magistrate for the county of Wexford. May I, therefore, beg you will be so good as to favour me with the necessary information on this point. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

"R. S. Carew. W. Graham."

This was the answer which was returned—

"*Castleborough, January* 4, 1832.

"Sir—I have this day had the honour of receiving your letter, and beg to inform you that the new Commission of the Peace for this county will be very shortly issued, by which the functions of the Magistrates under the former Commissions will cease, and any act done by them before they qualify under the new Commission would be illegal. I regret that I cannot, at present, give you any further information on the subject of your letter, which I have laid before his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant. When I am enabled to do so, I shall have the honour of communicating it. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

"W. Graham, Esq. R. S. Carew."

Subsequently, Captain Graham received the following letter;—

"*Castleborough, January* 10, 1832.

"Sir—I have the honour to inform you, that the new Commission for the county of Wexford will be immediately issued, and with reference to my former letter, in which I mentioned that I had laid your letter before his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, I beg to say, that it is not deemed expedient that your name should be replaced in the new Commission. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

"Captain Graham." "R. S. Carew."

This relieved the Lord Lieutenant of the county from all responsibility on this point. The matter, however, did not end there. Although Captain Graham had been once acquitted, his enemies were still urging on the Government the necessity of putting him and his companions once more on trial for murder. Captain Graham naturally felt anxious on the subject, knowing the bitter hatred of those enemies, and the little support which he was likely to receive from the Government; and, therefore, his Solicitor by his direction, wrote to the Attorney General a month before the last Assizes, to know whether the Government intended to institute a prosecution against him? The answer of the Attorney General was, that it was not the intention of the Government to do so. Notwithstanding that answer, Captain Graham was again put upon his trial! So sudden was the determination of the Government on this point—so little regard did they show for the feelings of individuals—that, actually, they had not made up their own minds as to the course they should pursue on the morning the Assizes commenced; for the Judge observed, in his charge to the Grand Jury, that he was in a state of uncertainty as to the course which the Crown would pursue with respect to the events at Newtownbarry. A bill of indictment was, however, preferred against Captain Graham, and immediately ignored. He must now mention one circumstance, though not immediately connected with the case of Captain Graham, to show the inexplicable manner in which the Government acted, and the little regard they exhibited for the feelings and interests of the persons implicated in the affair of Newtownbarry. The individual, from the report of whose trial he had been quoting (Mr. Kilfoy, one of the police), was put upon his trial for manslaughter. Dr. Hyde, who was a material witness in his favour, was then in Scotland. It had been the invariable practice of Government, whenever any of its functionaries had been put upon their trial, under circumstances similar to those in which Kilfoy stood, to grant funds to defray the expenses of bringing witnesses from a distance. An application was made to the Government for funds to defray the expense of bringing Dr. Hyde from Scotland. Kilfoy's friends were told that the application would be laid before the Attorney General, and his opinion taken upon it. They continued to call day after day, but no answer was given to their application. Kilfoy's trial was fixed for the 2nd of March, and at length, on the 25th of February, his solicitor was informed, too late for the post, that, on his client lodging an affidavit that the evidence of Dr. Hyde was absolutely necessary, the requisite funds for defraying the expense of that gentleman's journey would be provided. Was this proper conduct? Government was already in possession of an affidavit, stating that Dr. Hyde was a material witness; and yet no answer was given to Kilfoy's application until two or three days before the time fixed for the trial, when it was physically impossible that he could derive advantage from the proffered liberality of the Government. The life of this man might have been sacrificed, had it not been for the generosity of an individual, who gave *30l.* to defray the expenses of Dr. Hyde's journey. The Doctor arrived in time to give evidence, which was materially instrumental in obtaining the acquittal of the prisoner. He could not refrain from contrasting the conduct of Government towards Captain Graham with their conduct towards another Magistrate in the same neighbourhood, to whose case he had before adverted. An affidavit was forwarded to the Government, stating that this individual was in the habit of proceeding from chapel to chapel, urging the people to resist the payment of tithes. No notice, however, was taken of this representation of the Magistrates. He by no means asserted, that the information which was sworn to was correct—and he admitted that the gentleman in question felt much hurt at the charge which had been brought against him, and asserted, most solemnly, that it was false. For his argument, however, it mattered not whether the charge was true or false. What he complained of was, that the Magistrates were not informed by the Government whether the transactions reported by them had been investigated or not. All they knew was, that their representations were disregarded, whilst they saw, at this moment, the individual whom they accused, and whom they still believed to be guilty, supported by the Government, and made a Deputy Lord Lieutenant! On the other hand, they observed, that Captain Graham, who, to the best of his ability, exerted himself to preserve the peace of the country—was degraded, and struck out of the Commission of the Peace! He knew not whether the noble Duke, who, on a former evening, said that he had afforded a singular example of Irish justice, was now in his place—but, if he was, he would refer him to this transaction, as a specimen of what the Irish government considered to be even-handed justice. Could the Government expect that gentlemen in Ireland would exert themselves to preserve the peace of the country, when they were liable to be treated as Captain Graham had been? Government could not expect to receive the cordial co-operation of the Magistracy; and without that, they would be obliged to overrun Ireland with military in order to maintain tranquillity. He had now brought the whole case before the House, and had stated sufficient he hoped, to induce the House to agree to the motion for papers to elucidate the case. He begged leave to move "that there be laid before the House a copy of Mr. Stanley's circular letter to the Magistrates of Ireland, dated December 30, 1830."

The Marquis of *Anglesey:* My Lords, in the absence of my noble and learned friend, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, I rise to give a full explanation of the Motion which led to the decision of not replacing Captain Graham in the Commission of the Peace for the several counties where he has hitherto acted. I do this the more readily, because I entirely identify myself with my noble and learned friend in this case. I fully concur with him in the view he has taken of it, and am even quite ready to take the whole responsibility upon myself. I shall very much confine myself to that particular case, because I really am unequal to follow the noble Earl, who has made the Motion now before you, through all the variety of topics upon which he has descanted—of some of which I have no knowledge whatever—of others, but an imperfect recollection; and, as they are foreign to the case immediately in question, I think I may dispense with noticing them in detail. I will merely observe, that, if in the course of what I have to say, I should omit any material point which might require explanation, I would intreat the noble Lord to interrupt, and to put any question he may think fit; or, if he should be inclined to lay any stress upon the points on which I may not touch, if he will give me notice of it, I will take care to come prepared to meet him in explanation. I proceed now to the case before us:—Your Lordships are all aware that it is entirely in the province of the Chancellor to appoint Magistrates. So much inconvenience had been felt by former Chancellors, and more particularly by the late Chancellor Hart, who felt that he had made many improvident appointments, that in 1828 I determined upon recommending to his Majesty's Government, of which the noble and gallant Duke opposite was then at the head, to put the administration of county affairs in Ireland upon the same footing as those of England and Wales. I recommended that Lords Lieutenants of counties thould be appointed. The measure was approved, but it was not acted upon. After my dismissal, upon my return to resume the Government of Ireland, in 1830, it was one of my first acts to recommend its adoption. His Majesty's present servants entirely concurred in this view, and, by bringing in a Bill, they immediately effected the object. Upon the appointment of the Lieutenants of counties, a circular letter was addressed to them by the Chief Secretary, pointing out the required qualifications, explaining that certain specified offices would render those holding them ineligible; and particularly stating, that, although there might be persons then upon the Bench, whom, if this were an original appointment, it might not be desirable to place there, still, that being already there, if there was no very material objection to them as to character, they should be re-appointed. Now, my Lords, there is a great difference between erasing a name from the list, and merely declining to re-appoint the person, when, by the demise of the Crown, his Commission would cease. Captain Graham stood precisely in the predicament to be dealt with upon this rule. Captain Graham was not dismissed. He was merely not re-appointed. I mention this to show that there was not the least disposition to deal harshly by Captain Graham—but I do not wish to lay any stress upon it. I rest my vindication of the conduct of the Chancellor upon much firmer ground. My Lords, I assert that the Magistrates, of whom Captain Graham was one, in calling out the yeomanry, acted illegally. They had not the power to do so. The Lord Lieutenant of the county had not that power—even the Chief Governor is not authorised to call out the yeomanry except in cases of invasion, or of actual and well defined insurrection. The Magistrates have the full power to call upon the Members of these corps, separately and individually, to turn out and to support the civil authorities. They have even the power to compel them to act as special constables, and to fine and imprison them if they disobey; but they have not any authority to call them out as an armed organised body. I say, then, that, in doing this, they acted illegally; and that they acted most indiscreetly, it will be equally easy to show. My Lords, in considering this, your Lordships must bear in mind the actual state of the country. Owing to the indiscretion of that part of the people called Orangemen, and amongst whom there is a vast number of the yeomanry, this force has become particularly obnoxious. They had attended large meetings called together by a class of the highest order in the country, and who had lately assumed the title of Conservators. There the yeomen had frequently appeared in party colours, some in uniform, some armed, some even carrying the King's arms—here they had heard the most inflammatory harangues, they were brought to believe that the Catholics were to assume the ascendancy, that the Government was unfriendly to the Protestants, and no pains were omitted to inflame them against the Government, and against their fellow-subjects. Is it to be wondered at, then, my Lords, that these people, thus goaded to mischief, should frequently have effected it? My Lords, it rarely happened that these pernicious meetings did not terminate in some collision. Now, my Lords, let me not be misunderstood or misinterpreted in regard to what I have said, or think, of this body of the people. My Lords, I consider the yeomanry of Ireland to be brave, honest, independent, and loyal. I have no hesitation in saying, that, if I were in the unfortunate predicament to have to repel invasion and foreign aggression, I should feel proud and happy to place myself at their head—and I should feel the utmost confidence in leading them —but I must, at the same time, say (and I wish that all I have said were heard by them as well as your Lordships), I do think them the very last description of force that ought to be employed in cases of domestic disturbance. It ever did, and it will never fail, to lead to mischievous results. Let me also say, my Lords, that, although I cannot but highly deplore and condemn the conduct of those of the highest influence in the country, who are perpetually inflaming the minds of the Protestants, and encouraging, or rather forcing, them to believe that the Government is not favourable to their interests (than which a fouler calumny cannot be put forth), let me, I say, observe, that, in deploring the line of conduct they have pursued, I do not deny that they have met with great provocation. My Lords, there exists in Dublin a Society (indeed Societies) whose ramifications extend to every county, and whose sole object is, to vilify and calumniate every party in the State that does not partake of their revolutionary principles. These have assuredly been the first aggressors; but does even their misconduct justify the violence of the other party in vilifying and misrepresenting his Majesty's Government, and using every exertion to weaken it? My Lords, the Government of Ireland is taxed with condescending to rule upon the principles of conciliation—most assuredly that is the principle upon which it has been my ambition to act, but most lamentable has been my failure, for I find every act of the Government systematically misrepresented and calumniated. Each party, or rather the extremes of each party, being bitter and unforgiving, because each discovers that there is not the slightest chance of its being permitted to assume the ascendancy and to dictate to the Government. This is the miserable state of the public mind in Ireland. Is it, then, under such a state of things, that the yeomanry ought to have been called out? In addition to all that I have already said, I must add, that the county of Wexford was only at that moment recovering from the agitation and excitement of two county elections, where party spirit had run unusually high. I say, then, my Lords, that the calling upon the yeomanry was an act of the greatest indiscretion. It was illegal. It was indiscreet, and I will show that it was unnecessary. The noble Earl has stated, that there was no troops within thirty miles, therefore he conceives Captain Graham acted judiciously in calling out the yeomanry. Now, my Lords, the fact is not so. Regular troops were within reach. There was ample time to draw them to Newtownbarry. There was a small garrison at Wexford, only twenty-one miles distant. There was also troops at Carlow, distant fourteen miles; and I believe that there was also a small detachment still nearer. Be that as it may, there was ample time to move even from the most distant station, and I will answer for it, that, had these troops been employed, not a drop of blood would have been spilt. I will now come to the conduct of Captain Graham during the affray. Upon this there is a most conflicting and contradictory evidence; many witnesses swore positively that they heard the word "fire" given by that officer; others swore as positively that he did not give that order. Now, here I must remark, without, however, meaning to bear hard upon Captain Graham, that the evidence of the former witnesses is positive; they say they heard the word, whilst the others can only prove that they did not hear—not that the word was not given, for it might have been given when they were out of hearing; others, one I am sure, and I believe two, swore that the Captain did not give the word "fire," but that, in order to prevent them, he said "fie, fie." Now, my Lords, if this be the case, is it not lamentable that the lives of men should be contingent on the accurate distinction between the words "fire," and "fie?" Most assuredly that officer could not, in the whole vocabulary, have fixed upon a word of more equivocal sound than of "fie," when it was used to prevent the effect which the word "fire" would have produced. Upon this subject I find it difficult to come to a satisfactory result; I rather lean to the opinion, that Captain Graham did not give the word "fire," and, certainly, he did exert himself to prevent the continuance of the firing. The consequence of this lamentable affair was truly distressing! No one who was not in the county, or who did not receive accurate and daily intelligence, can form a notion of the agitation, the irritability, and the frightful excitement, it occasioned. Many of the yeomanry absconded—some, I am assured, left the country; of those who remained, and from whom bail was taken to answer the charges against them at the next Assizes, it became necessary to escort them to their residences under a guard, in order that they might not fall a prey to the fury of the people, or come again into collision with them. It was also necessary to place safe-guards in some of the houses. The friends of Captain Graham prevailed upon him to quit the country; he judiciously and humanely consented to do so. I say humanely, because the character of that gentleman as an officer stands too high to imagine he would do so from personal consideration, and I am quite certain that he took this step from motives of humanity, and to avoid any increased irritation by his presence. Here, my Lords, I feel that I may close this case. I imagine that your Lordships will concur with me in thinking that the employment of the yeomanry was—even if not illegal—at least indiscreet, and that it was unnecessary; and that, under these circumstances, coupled, too, with the fact, that Captain Graham was not possessed of any landed property in Wexford, a sound discretion has been exercised in not naming him on the Commission. The noble Marquis then alluded in pointed terms to an attack made on him in his absence by the noble Marquis (the Marquis of Westmeath). What could be the noble Marquis's motive? He could not fear to answer me as a debater. He knew that I had no practice—no experience—and that in the way of argument I was incapable of taking any advantage. The noble Marquis must have felt, that upon that score he had the superiority. What, then, could have actuated him? My Lords, the noble Marquis did not like to encounter the plain facts, which he knew I should, at all events, be able to bring forward, and which he must have been conscious would have blown his Address (for I maintain that it is his Address, and not the Address of the Magistrates of Westmeath, his writing is legible in every line of it), his speech and arguments to the winds. With respect to the motives of the noble Earl for bringing forward the Motion now before us, and at this particular time, I 'should more easily have accounted, if he had not been a practised and a finished speaker. Although the noble Earl may not himself, have suffered under the desperate inflictions of my noble and learned friend, yet, as he must have occasionally witnessed the painful writhings of some of his noble friends, under my noble and learned friend's powerful lash, I might have been tempted to believe that the noble Earl would feel some relief from knowing that the moment he was speaking there was a wide channel, and 300 miles of land between him and the person he was calling to account. No such motive, however, could actuate the noble Earl, and, therefore, I am wholly at a loss to account for his conduct. My Lords, if I was not afraid of trespassing too severely upon your Lordships' patience I would gladly be permitted, if the rule of the House do not preclude me from doing so, to make some observations upon the papers now lying upon your Lordships' Table upon the motion of the noble Marquis, the Lieutenant of Westmeath. I allude to the address of that noble Lord and the Magistrates of that county. To save your Lordships' time as much as possible, I will, without circumlocution, proceed to make a few remarks upon the most prominent paragraphs of that address. The first I would notice runs thus:—'We 'beg leave to represent that the state of 'the laws do not afford that sort of discouragement to that crime, that would 'amount to an adequate protection for 'those who would rally to them, if they 'saw they dare assist in bringing the of'fenders to justice.' Now I should be glad to ask what sort of further discouragement than that which the law gives, the noble Marquis would propose? Fine—imprisonment — transportation — Death. These are the discouragements which the law already affords, and I should wish to learn what can be added to these? My ingenuity presents nothing beyond these but torture, and I hardly imagine that, in this enlightened age, this could be seriously thought of. The next paragraph to which I would refer is as follows:—'We 'humbly beg leave to observe to your Ex'cellency that a leading feature of this 'system is, that it involves the forfeiture 'of human life as the penalty for any 'breach committed against its various im'positions, although the presumed offences 'are undefined, and vary from one moment 'to another; indeed solely arising out of 'the caprices of savage men, broke loose 'from restraint, in a country, the laws of 'which command the respect of all other 'parts of the United Kingdom subject to 'them.' It would seem by this sentence that the actual law does command the respect of all other parts of the United Kingdom. How comes it, then, that there only it fails? Is it shown that any extraordinary exertion has been made by the authorities to meet the licentiousness of the turbulent? Have there been meetings of the gentry to combine, and unite, and organise a system to resist outrage? Has there been any previous representation to the Government? Has application been made to proclaim the county, or at least the most disturbed Baronies? Has an additional constabulary force been applied for? Is there a single instance in which a military force has been required, that it has not been sent? Have the tenantry been encouraged to support their landlords in any vigorous exertions to support the law? Have special constables been sworn in? Has the noble Marquis himself set a laudable example? Has he collected his servants, his tenants, his dependants—all those over whom he must have influence? Has he asked them to turn out and protect his neighbourhood from outrage? And if he has not, must he not upon reflection acknowledge that such a course would be more likely to effect tranquillity, than writing, within a a well barricaded house, angry letters to violent and ungrateful agitators, and denouncing the population of a whole country? My Lords, I know, and I say it confidently, there is a vast number of the people who if properly called on and encouraged, would willingly combine with the gentry in the suppression of crime. I will simply relate one striking occurrence in exemplification of this. At the late Assizes of the Queen's County, held at Maryborough, several persons were upon trial for Whiteboy offences. A witness of the name of Dunne was under examination. A Magistrate, known to be of very high party feeling, and not a very constant resident, asked him, in a somewhat imperious tone—" And pray, Sir, do the farmers in your neighbourhood look on at these proceedings, and take no pains to check them?" The farmer replied in a sturdy tone—" No, Sir, they do not; but if you and those who call themselves gentlemen, and the Magistrates (instead of skulking out of the country when the danger comes on), were to help the farmers as they ought, these disturbances would have been put down long ago." The farmer was a Catholic. " We come next (says the address) to the case of Thomas Grotley, a man of notoriously desperate character, who was taken in his progress from the county of Meath, to which he belonged, through a part of the country with a carriage and money in his possession, for the purpose of swearing in and organizing the people, with seditious papers and in their nature treasonable, found upon him, one of them exulting in the confusion of Britain, as the triumph of the system he was organizing. This miscreant was enlarged from the prison he never ought to have left, upon the avowed opinion of the Attorney General, that although the papers were found upon him no tangible case could be made out to convict him as the law now stands." This is a very plain story: a bad character was travelling through the county, papers were found upon him he was taken up and sent to jail. The noble Lord pronounces that these papers were treasonable and of a seditious nature, and that he had been enlarged from a prison he ought never to have left. This is the noble Lord's opinion: that of the Attorney General is different. He says, that, upon these papers no tangible case could be made out, and he was accordingly enlarged. I think the House will go along with me in thinking, that upon a point of law, the Attorney General was the better judge. We then meet with this passage:—" Upon these facts thus selected, and upon the mass of crime which, if enumerated here, would swell a folio, we mainly rest our assertion." Why, my Lords, here is a folio filled already, and closely filled with assertions which cannot be proved. It goes on to say—" The laws at present are utterly powerless to check the progress of a system so destructive to society, or to reach the known abettors of its blood-thirsty organization; a state of things to which open rebellion would be preferable as that might be dealt with by a corresponding power adequate to the evil." To this conclusion, my Lords, I cannot come. I totally dissent from it. Open rebellion would evidently entail a frightful loss of life. The present state of the country is, I admit, extremely deplorable—but, inasmuch as I feel certain that it may by union and proper exertions be tranquillized, I greatly prefer it to the other alternative. The Address goes on to say—" We have assembled to prepare a respectful Address to your Excellency, and petitions to Parliament, but we cannot, in the utmost stretch of respect, acknowledge to your Excellency or the Legislature that system to be sound which subjects the peaceable and industrious members of the community to the ravages of the depraved; or that, although one offence, in a given mass of enormity, may meet a tardy retribution, still leaves exposed all that is valuable in a trading and agricultural country to the tyranny of savage caprice." Here, my Lords, is a direct libel upon the whole system of law and jurisprudence of the United Kingdom, applicable, not merely to the present moment, or to any particular spot, but to every place; and to meet the views of the noble Marquis, it would be absolutely necessary for your Lordships to go into a revision and alteration of all those laws under which the empire has been enjoying more freedom, more happiness, and more prosperity, than any other portion of the known world; and to prove these calumniated laws are not asleep, but in actual operation, I beg leave to lay upon the Table, a catalogue of punishments which have been the results of the last Spring Assizes, and which it is truly painful to contemplate. The Address concludes with this remarkable paragraph:— " With great respect, we conceive it to be nothing less than an absurdity to leave the enjoyment of the privileges of free Government unsuspended among a peasantry who know not its value, or are so far corrupted as not to appreciate its advantages." Upon the whole, my Lords, this Address deals only in general abuse of the existing laws and institutions, without specifying defects, or suggesting a single remedy, and it concludes with a sweeping anathema against a whole population, denouncing it as utterly unworthy of enjoying the privileges of a free Government. I need not trouble your Lordships with my answer to it. It is on your Lordships' Table. I will merely say, that upon the fullest reflection, I cannot retract one word of its sentiments. I utterly deny that there is anything offensive in a single sentence, and I do assure your Lordships that it was written in a spirit of the most perfect good feeling towards the Magistrates of Westmeath.

The Marquis of *Westmeath* said, that, as allusion had been made to him, he felt it necessary to repeat what he had distinctly declared on a former evening—namely, that he was actuated by no feeling of hostility to the noble Marquis in the Motion which he had then brought forward. As to the address which had been referred to, he had no hesitation in avowing that he had written it, but it had been approved of generally by the Magistracy of Westmeath. He could assure their Lordships that he had no intention of taking advantage of the absence of the noble Marquis the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when he brought forward his Motion, and, if he had thought that such an idea could have been entertained, he should not have brought the subject forward. But he had brought it before their Lordships as an act of the Irish Government of which he disapproved. He considered such acts to be fair and open subjects of discussion, and that, in the present state of the country, consideration for individuals ought to give way to the interests of the public. He was quite ready to avow that, whenever a military force was demanded, the noble Marquis was most willing to give it; but he felt some regard for the King's troops, and he did not wish to see them harassed by encounters with a population who made a mockery of them, and could disperse like flies whenever occasion required. The Magistrates only asked for protection for life and property. It was said that they ought to stay at home and do their duty. For his own part, he wished to God he was at home now; but he was here—and could not be in two places at once. He must say that the Irish Government, in not taking vigorous means for the restoration of tranquillity and the protection of property, was in his opinion very much to blame.

The Earl of *Roden* said, that after hearing the several statements made by the noble Earl who brought the matter before the House, and the noble Marquis's reply thereto, he must maintain that the charges which the noble Earl had brought against Government for their conduct respecting Captain Graham had been fully substantiated, and he could not help thinking that that individual had been the object of great and unmerited persecution and hardship. The noble Marquis (Anglesey) said that the reason which induced the Government of Ireland to omit the name of Captain Graham from the commission of the peace for the counties of Wexford Carlow, and Meath, was his having called out the Yeomanry without being sufficiently authorised to do so. The noble Marquis said, there was no intention on the part of Government to act with harshness towards that gentleman, but he (the Earl of Roden) could not conceive any more harsh act than putting a gentleman on his trial twice for the same offence, and causing him an expense of upwards of 400*l.*, for the vindication of his character. The result, indeed, was highly honourable to Captain Graham. It was fully proved that he was a most honourable and upright man. As to its being illegal to call out the Yeomanry, he would beg to refer their Lordships to a letter addressed by Mr. Stanley to a gentleman of the name of Moore, residing in the same county in which Captain Graham lived, in which he alluded to the disturbed state in which the country then was, and recommended the Magistrates generally to act with resolution, and if necessary (in the event of a decided manifestation of resistance to the laws) to call for the assistance of the Yeomanry corps. Yet because he had done this very act was the chief reason assigned for the dismissal of Captain Graham, he, therefore, left the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Secretary for Ireland, to reconcile that difference. Further the noble Marquis said, that Captain Graham had acted indiscreetly; but there again he was contradicted by the Judge who tried the cause; and he, (the Earl of Roden) also trusted many of their Lordships fully agreed with the learned Judge. It was then said in extenuation of the dismissal that Captain Graham had little or no property in the county of Wexford, and consequently ought not to be on its commission. This he had no hesitation in stating openly was a mere quibble and pretext for injustice. Did such a circumstance exclude other individuals from being retained on the commission? There was Mr. Challoner, the agent of the estates of the Earl Fitzwilliam in the county of Wicklow, who, although possessed of little property in that county, was invested with the duties of a Magistrate. He really could not but regret that such idle and absurd excuses should be tendered in explanation of an act of injustice. It might be fairly asked, if the allegations of the Irish Government were unfounded, to what was the dismissal attributable? He would tell their Lordships; Captain Graham was dismissed in obedience to the directions of demagogues, a class unfortunately too prevalent in Ireland, and to whose influence still more unfortunately the Government of that country seemed inclined on all occasions to bow. These demagogues were individually pledged to the destruction of Protestantism in Ireland, and naturally every man who had the hardihood to offer his support to that religion became the object of their hate and persecution. One of that class was Captain Graham. He was known in Ireland to be an individual who made it his object and endeavour to support the Church whose religion he professed, against the open and daring attacks which were being made against it; and by his honest and open avowal of his principles he became obnoxious to the feelings of all those whom he had just described as pledged to the annihilation of the Protestant religion in Ireland. The neglect and want of countenance which the Government of Ireland had shown to the Protestant gentry of that country was productive of the worst consequences. Those individuals had for some time past looked upon themselves as badly treated: and he could assure the House that the manner in which Captain Graham had suffered had not contributed to improve that feeling. There was not a Protestant who did not regard the dismissal of that individual as demonstrative of what might be expected from a resistance to the efforts of insidious agitators, having for their object the expatriation of the Protestant gentry. Indeed since the present Government had entered upon their office they had been guilty of a total disregard, nay, more than that, of a studied and avowed scheme to destroy Protestant influence, if not the Protestant Church, in Ireland. And what was the motive which influenced Government in this respect? Why, the weak and vain desire of conciliating mob demagogues. In the first place Government had introduced a measure relating to education. They withdrew the grant from that society which afforded the children of the Protestant poor the sole means of being brought up in the full knowledge of the Scriptures, and bestowed the grant thus withdrawn upon a Board which put into the hands of the people the Bible in a mutilated form, and which separated a moral from a religious course of education. Then again in the Reform Bill, what was the avowed object of one of its clauses? If their Lordships would look into that Bill they would see the little care that was taken of the Protestant portion of the constituency. In the English Bill, as their Lordships might be aware, the existing rights of freemen, under certain restrictions, were vested in their children, but in the Irish Bill no such provision was made. Now, when speaking of that clause on the occasion of the introduction of the Bill, what was the language used by the right hon. Secretary for Ireland? After stating that it was determined by Ministers that the rights of freemen should cease on their demise, Mr. Stanley said, that this determination was occasioned by the circumstance that in Ireland the freemen of corporations were for the most part Protestants, whence if their rights were to be continued to their children a set of Protestant constituents would be formed and perpetuated; a state of things which he openly avowed it was far from the wish of Ministers should take place. He begged to ask their Lordships if such a statement was not enough to induce an apprehension in the minds of the Protestant gentry that their religion was in danger of being sacrificed to the wishes and dictates of the demagogue portion of the Irish people? In addition to this there were many other acts of the present Government in which the Protestants of Ireland felt themselves much aggrieved. They perceived that in several instances persons were chosen for public situations in consequence of the dictation of a certain knot of demagogues, who held their periodical parliaments in Dublin, and who of late were in the habit of issuing their orders in council, as it were, directing who were and who were not to be appointed to official situations. Noble Lords on the opposite side of the House might dissent from his statement, but he still would maintain it; and, what was of more importance, could prove it. In one instance an individual was named as Deputy Lieutenant for the county of Sligo, although possessed of little property, and less influence, in that county, merely because he was brought into notice, having been nominated as a fit and proper person about a week before the date of his appointment by Mr. O'Connell, at one of his demagogue and mob-agitating assemblies. Such was the state in which Ireland then was—a state into which she had been reduced by the weak, irresolute, and temporising system pursued by its Government—a system which, unless it was not only restrained but destroyed, would soon render its Government a mere farce. He spoke warmly on the subject but he assured their Lordships he but spoke as he felt. The speech of the noble Marquis seemed to imply, that there was no part of Ireland in a disturbed state except the county of Kilkenny, but if the noble Marquis had that belief, he was very ill served by his new allies in the county of Kildare; such was the state of society, that it was described by a noble friend of his (the Marquis of Ormond), to be worse than in a state of open warfare, that it would be better for a man to know his enemies and to meet them face to face than to be waylaid as at present in the roads and defiles, without the least power of defence. Look again to the state of Queen's County. At a meeting held the other day by the Magistracy, resolutions were passed stating that the laws were openly violated, that crime, intimidation, and outrage were increasing, that the civil power was unable to cope with the difficulties, and that more energetic measures were required to put an end to such terrible disorders; and it was agreed that a petition founded on these facts should be presented to Parliament. He would not go through the melancholy detail of crime by which these facts were fully borne out, but he would say that, if the present system falsely called conciliation was persevered in, these enormities which were at present confined to particular districts, would spread throughout the land. The noble Marquis had said, that the people of Ireland were divided into great parties, and that Government could obtain the support of neither of the extremes of those parties; but so far as the one party the Protestants were concerned he believed there was no extremes, that they were united almost as one man in opposing the miserable policy of expediency. It was urged that they had united themselves in societies. They were united, and he thought they ought to be united. Government had in a measure withdrawn its countenance from them, and unless they formed a union among themselves for the security of their property, lives, and interests, their existence in Ireland would be precarious. They had likewise united with a determination of upholding their religion, and he was satisfied that to that union while life remained they would stand fast. Before he concluded, he desired to allude to one other topic in the noble Marquis's speech. The noble Marquis said, that if the Magistrates of Ireland did not timidly skulk out of the country there would be little or no disturbance. He begged to repel the imputation which the noble Marquis seemed desirous of fixing on the Magistrates. They were no skulkers. Nothing could be further from their intentions than to skulk out of the country. The Magistrates of Ireland were as brave and intrepid a set of men as ever existed in any country. If they, in some instances, did not act with the resolution with which they were in the habit of acting, it arose from no fear of personal consequences, but from a conviction that they could not rely on the support of Government in any measure they might deem necessary to adopt according to their own judgment.

The Marquis of *Anglesey* begged to remind the noble Earl that he had not charged the Magistrates with "skulking from danger;" quite the contrary: he had merely repeated those words as part of the evidence of a farmer, to show that the class of persons of whom the witness was one were not unwilling to assist the Magistrates, if called upon. The number of persons brought to punishment for crime at the last Spring Assizes was sufficient to show that the Magistrates were not remiss in their duty. The calendar of the convictions at the Assizes which had lately terminated, he regretted to say, was exceedingly frightful, but it was right the House should be put in possession of it:—38 persons were sentenced to be transported for life; 342 for seven years: 106 had sentence of death recorded against them; 64 had been left for execution; and 19 were actually executed.

The Marquis of *Clanricarde* said, that he was decidedly of opinion, that the Government of Ireland had acted perfectly right in pursuing the course they had adopted in the case of Captain Graham. After the representations which were made to them respecting the feeling of the people of Ireland in regard to that individual's conduct, it would have been most impolitic to have retained him in the Commission of the peace. He did not mean, for his own part, to cast the slightest imputation on Captain Graham's character; indeed, from the representations which had been made to him, he believed him to be a highly honourable man; but still he was of opinion that if his conduct was such as to give general dissatisfaction, which he understood was the case, he ought not to be retained upon the Commission. He thought it should be also considered that the Catholic population of Wexford—and the population of that county was principally Catholic—entertained very strong feelings as to Captain Graham's conduct; consequently, if not on grounds of justice, which he was far from admitting, on the grounds of prudence alone his dismissal was proper. It was said, that the Government of Ireland ought to maintain the law, and that they ought not for trifling faults to act with severity against Magistrates. True, but how did that argument hold in the case of Captain Graham? What was the trifling act in which his name, justly or unjustly it was not then for him to say, had been implicated? Twenty-two individuals were known to have been shot by the Yeomanry under his command. Was this a trifling act, or one which the Government of the country would be justified in passing over? Unquestionably not. Indeed he was convinced such would have been the hatred of the people of Ireland to the laws of that country had not Captain Graham been dismissed, that in a short time both it and the Government of the country would have become a dead letter, totally disregarded and laughed at. Considerable stress was laid on the rejection of the bills against Captain Graham by the Grand Jury, and the language addressed by the Judge of Assize on that occasion. As to the address of Baron Foster, he thought it ought not to be regarded with too much consideration, for it was absolutely impossible that a man who had lived all his life in the midst of a party could divest himself of his private feelings, particularly when the decision of the Grand Jury gave him a pretext for indulging in them. The noble Earl who had last spoken had been particularly vehement against the sufferance of assemblies composed of demagogues, as he termed them, whose sole object he stated to be the destruction of the Protestant Church and the Repeal of the Union. Did then the noble Earl think that the Orange party in Ireland, by their conduct and bearing towards their brethren, would further the maintenance of the Union? If the noble Earl cherished such an opinion it was not one in which he participated. On the contrary, it appeared to him that the line of policy pursued by the Orange party was inimical to the maintenance of that Union which they professed to avdocate. To such an extent did he carry this opinion, that if called upon to make a comparison between the Irish demagogues and Irish Orange conservatives, he should give the preference to the former. The principles of the Orange party were in fact most unjustifiable and unprincipled, and calculated beyond any thing else to lead to the separation of the two countries. As a sample of the spirit in which persons belonging to those Associations conducted themselves, he need only refer to an address delivered lately at a great conservative meeting by a Mr. Archdale, a clergyman too, he believed. The Christian spirit of this address might be judged of when he informed the House that the speaker exhorted his hearers "to put their trust in God and keep their powder dry." That was a proper speech indeed for a Protestant clergyman, though it had not the merit of originality. If the present state of the law was not sufficient, he begged to know what the noble Marquis (Westmeath) and others wished for? Was it for martial law? If this was their desire let it be openly stated. He resided a good deal in Ireland, and for his own part, he knew of no instance in which the law had been put in force and in which it was not efficient; and he believed that what was wanted was, the vigorous exertion of the law, in all cases and towards all persons.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* felt himself bound to stand up in defence of a Magistrate who, he considered, had been harshly treated for the conscientious performance of a public duty. The noble Marquis (the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), with that frankness and generosity which generally characterised him, had taken the blame of this transaction on himself, but he (the Earl of

Winchilsea) thought it ought more properly to fall on the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, who had advised the proceeding now complained of. Captain Graham be it remembered, did not act on the occasion referred to by himself—he acted with two other Magistrates; and, though it had been repeatedly alleged that Captain Graham had acted indiscreetly, after reading over the evidence, he could not bring his mind to that conclusion. If any blame rested on Captain Graham, however, it rested equally on the other two Magistrates who acted with him. Whilst on this subject he was most anxious to ascertain whether the law really was as laid down by the noble Marquis (Anglesey); was it a fact that a Yeomanry corps could not legally be called out by the Magistrates unless in a case of invasion, or "well-defined insurrection?" those he believed, were the words of the noble Marquis. He was the more anxious on this point, as it happened only a few weeks ago that the Magistrates of the county with which he was connected called for the assistance of the Kentish Yeomanry for the protection of property. Now he wished to know if that was illegal? Had not Captain Graham and his brother Magistrates called out the Yeomanry, he believed that the lives of many more persons would have been lost; and how the Government could feel itself justified in censuring Captain Graham, by omitting his name from the Commission, he knew not, as that gentleman had been tried twice for the same offence, and not only honourably acquitted, but complimented by the Judge who presided for the discretion, humanity, and kindness with which he acted. The Orange Association of Ireland having been alluded to in terms of such severe censures by the noble Marquis (Clanricarde), he (Lord Winchilsea) felt bound to state that he had enrolled his name in that loyal Association; and he trusted the Protestants of England would follow the example set them in the sister country. Their objects were, to support the Protestant religion—to uphold the laws of the country—to maintain the just succession to the Crown, and to defend the true religious establishments of the empire. Such an association was a species of institution entitled to the respect and support of every sound-hearted Protestant. He would conclude by declaring his intention to support the motion, and he hoped the noble Earl would follow it up by an address to his Majesty to reinstate Captain Graham.

Lord *Templemore* observed, that the Lord Lieutenant of Wexford was adverse to the omission of the name of Captain Graham from the list of Magistrates, simply because he feared that such a proceeding might seem to prejudge the case which was about to be tried at the Assizes. Captain Graham had but a few fields in the neighbourhood. He believed they were situated in Carlow, not in Wexford, and it was not necessary to place him in the Commission of the Peace for that county, when a great number of resident gentlemen might be found to undertake the office.

The Earl of *Eldon* observed, that he did not know whether the law of Ireland differed from that of England with respect to the calling out of the Yeomanry. But, at all events, were he in the Commission of the Peace in England he should not hesitate for one moment to call out either the Yeomanry or any other class of the King's subjects, to maintain the peace or preserve the property of the lieges. Every man in this realm, who was likely to be despoiled of his effects, had a right to call upon every other man to assist him in defending them.

Lord *Cloncurry* wished to call the attention of their Lordships to the law on this subject, which, with respect to Ireland, was explicit and direct. It pointed out distinctly when the Yeomanry might be called out. The Act of 4 Geo. 4th, cap. 15, said, "that in all cases of invasion, or insurrection, or apprehension of insurrection, in Ireland, it would be lawful for his Majesty's Justices of the Peace to call out the Yeomanry." Did that provision, he would ask, apply to the present case? He would assert, that there was no country the people of which were more disposed to respect the laws than Ireland, if they saw those laws administered with justice and impartiality. No matter with what severity they were administered, the people were disposed to respect them if they saw them administered equally to all classes. Though he was unwilling to trespass longer on the attention of their Lordships, he could not forbear to state what had been omitted by the noble Earl who opened this discussion, and the noble Marquis who followed him; he meant the circumstances out of which this fatal affair had arisen. The fact was, that it arose out of a dispute as to whether or not the tithes claimed were due. It appeared by the evidence on the Coroner's inquest, published by the House of Commons, that the tithe was not strictly due. The people who lost their lives by the imprudence of Captain Graham, said, they would leave the question in dispute to two country gentlemen, the sons of clergymen. Mr. M'Clintock was ready to leave it to two lawyers. The clergyman was willing, also, to accept the Composition Act, if the people would make him an advance to pay his tithe-proctor. They did pay him in advance, and afterwards the clergyman wanted them to continue to pay in advance. This only part of them agreed to. The point in dispute was, whether what they had paid in advance should be set down to their credit or not. Then came a Magistrate, who issued his orders as a Magistrate to himself as a Yeoman, and he went forth as a tithe-proctor, driver, and Yeoman, to execute the orders he gave as a Magistrate. He admitted that the laws were not respected in Ireland, but the reason was, that the gentry were guilty of breaches of the law. They were the first to break them. It was the duty of Magistrates to call out the yeomanry and military in certain cases, but the Magistrates ought never to leave them to themselves. Much of the evil of Ireland arose from the destitution and want of employment of the people; only find them employment, and double the population, and the people of Ireland would be a blessing to the empire. But certainly there could be no peace in that country while a Magistrate could go out and shoot people for something like amusement. The people were naturally irritated at the whole proceeding, and it was found that in other parts of the country the affair of Newtownbarry had made a most unfavourable impression. Captain Graham ought, in his opinion, to have been removed the instant the act was committed which had given rise to the debate.

The Earl of *Eldon* must beg leave to repeat that it was a mistake to suppose that the Yeomanry might not be called out to preserve the peace and protect property, as well as any other class of subjects. He had himself had occasion to call for their aid some time ago, not as yeomen, indeed, but as fellow-subjects, for the protection of property; and, if they had refused to come, they would have subjected themselves to an indictment. As to the dismissal of a man from the commission of the peace, he must say, for his own part, that he had never done so, during the time he had the honour to hold the Great Seal, without strict inquiry as to his conduct, and into all the circumstances of the case alleged against him. He did not know that it was done so in this instance.

Viscount *Melbourne* thought it was very natural that his noble friend (the Marquis of Anglesey) should have made a few observations on his own conduct, which had led to a general debate on the state of Ireland, which he did not mean to go into. Without noticing, therefore, the extraneous topics which had been introduced in the course of this discussion, he begged leave shortly to advert to the Motion really before the House. In the first place, he wished to call their Lordships' attention to the extreme inconvenience of the Motion itself, and of the extremely inconvenient precedent which would be established if such a Motion should be acceded to. The appointment, the re-nomination, or the dismissal of a Magistrate in Ireland, were prerogatives of the Crown, exercised by the Lord Chancellor—and certainly ought not to be interfered with by any vote of that House. He trusted, therefore, that their Lordships would consider seriously before they countenanced any Motion of such a nature as that then before them. The Lord Chancellor might not always be able to state the reasons why he had removed a Magistrate from the Commission; and, if their Lordships consented to such motions as this, it would lead to most inconvenient interference with the prerogative of the Crown. The noble Earl who brought forward the Motion, commenced his statement by reading certain letters which had been issued by a Member of the Government, exhorting the Irish Magistracy to an active, zealous, and energetic discharge of their duty. He supposed that the noble Earl read those letters in order to lead the House to conclude that the Government was not prepared to support those whom they had thus exhorted, if any unfortunate results should ensue. But he was sure their Lordships would remember that, in the same letters, the Irish Magistracy—at the same time that they were exhorted to act with vigour—were also exhorted to act with prudence, discretion, and temper. With respect to this particular case, Captain Graham had been wanting in all these qualities. In the first place, he called out the Yeomanry, being all Protestants, to act against a population of Catholics. Next, they were called out by the person who commanded them, and on a question of a doubtful and difficult nature—a question of Tithes. He might and ought to have called out the military. He was imprudent also in ordering the sale on a fair-day. These were sufficient reasons for not re-inserting his name in the Commission of the Peace when it was renewed, which was very different from taking his name out of the Commission while the Commission was yet existing. As to the opinions of the Judge, quoted by the noble Earl (Wicklow), he thought they were of no authority, except on a point of law; and, in his political opinion, he did not concur with the Judge. At the same time the Judge had only stated, if the witnesses for the defendant spoke true, that the conduct of Captain Graham was praiseworthy. The other cases quoted by the noble Earl (Wicklow) did not bear on the point; because the noble Earl had not stated what were the circumstances of these other cases; and, unless these circumstances were stated, no correct opinion could be formed. He admitted that the description given of the affray at Newtownbarry, by the noble Earl, was correct; but he must say, that the whole of the evil at Newtownbarry was caused by the Yeomanry. The firing was begun by the Yeomanry, and continued much longer than it ought to have been, and would have been, if they had been military. He was apprehensive that there must be some mistake in the assertion that Captain Graham was informed, on an application to the Attorney General, that no further proceedings should be taken against him. The Attorney General could not have made such a statement, because he could not tell what additional evidence might be brought to light. A second prosecution might be the result of such evidence, and proved no particular asperity on the part of the prosecutor. With respect to the Motion, some of the papers moved for were already published; the Report made by Mr. Green was intended solely for the Lord Lieutenant, and he hoped that the noble Earl would not press for that document.

The Earl of *Wicklow* said, he found it necessary to make a few observations on the various statements which had issued from the opposite side of the House. The noble Marquis, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, had insinuated that this case had been postponed till the period when the noble and learned Lord, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, was absent. When his noble friend (the Marquis of Westmeath) brought forward the Motion some time since—to which reference had already been made—the noble and learned Lord accused the noble Marquis of doing so, because the noble Marquis, the Lord Lieutenant, was absent in Ireland; and now he was accused of having introduced his Motion because the noble and learned Lord was absent. He was well aware of the great talents and sarcastic powers of that noble and learned Lord, yet he should have had no objection to meet him upon the present question; and certainly his absence had made no difference in his plans. The noble Marquis stated, as a reason for the dismissal of Captain Graham, that he had been guilty of an illegal act in calling out the Yeomanry. That law, as laid down by the noble Marquis, was directly contrary, not only to the usually received impressions on the subject, but to the circular letter of Mr. Stanley. For his part, he would not hesitate to say, that, having previously seen a precisely similar case in which the conduct pursued met with the approbation of the Government, he should have thought it his duty, under similar circumstances, to have acted exactly as Captain Graham did. The noble Marquis also cast some aspersions upon the Yeomanry concerned on that occasion, and stated that some of them had fled the country. He was not surprised that such should be the case; and the statement of the noble Marquis made it imperative on him to declare some further facts. Very shortly after that transaction, one of the Yeomanry engaged, who had received a shot in his knee which was with difficulty extracted, had his house burned to the ground. A letter was written by Lord Farnham to the Lord Lieutenant, mentioning this gross outrage, and requesting that a proclamation should be issued for the discovery of the perpetrators. He obtained an answer, in which the Lord Lieutenant stated that that should be done. No proclamation had, however, been issued up to that day. In the course of the debate it had again been intimated, that Captain Graham had given the orders to fire; but any noble Lord, who would take the trouble to read the evidence, must be convinced that could not be the fact—for, when the firing commenced, Captain Graham was not with the Yeomanry, but was heading a column of police. Again, the letter from the Lord Lieutenant, expressing disapprobation of the conduct of the Magistrates, was not addressed to Captain Graham, but to Mr. Brereton; from which it appeared, his Excellency thought both Magistrates in fault, although one of them only was selected for punishment. Such a distinction made the case appear more invidious. After what had been stated by the noble Viscount (Melbourne), he would not press his Motion to a division.

Motion negatived.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, April 16, 1832.

Minutes.] Return ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Pringle, Copy of the last Appointment to the Office of Clerk to the admission of Notaries in Scotland.

Petitions presented. By Mr. Davies Gilbert, from the Gravesend Steam Boat Company, to be allowed to carry an additional Number of Passengers in proportion to their Tonnage:—By the Sheriffs of the City of London, from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, for the Abolition of unnecessary Oaths:—By Mr. Granby Calcraft, from the Inhabitants of Wareham in favour of the New Plan of Education for Ireland. By Mr. James Brownlow, from the Clergy, Gentry, and Inhabitants of Manchester, the Inhabitants of Cheltenham, Rochester, Chatham, Stroud, and Canterbury:—By Mr. J. Wynne, from the Inhabitants of Crossmoline, Adrigoole, Glenlough, and other Places, against the said Plan:—By Mr. Bayntun, from the Managers of the York Savings Bank, for the Repeal of so much of the Act 9 George 4th as limited the Amount of Investments by depositors:—By Colonel Torrens, from the Proprietors of *The Bolton Chronicle*, for the Repeal of all Taxes on Knowledge.

Education (Ireland) Petitions.] The Sheriffs of the City of London presented a Petition from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, approving of the new plan of Education proposed to be introduced into Ireland, and praying that the House would sanction the same.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* said, as one of the Representatives for the metropolis, he felt himself called upon to support the prayer of the petition. The petitioners found it necessary to lay their sentiments before the House in consequence of the remarks made by hon. Members on presenting petitions containing a contrary prayer, in doing which they assumed that the opinion of the country was with them. He begged leave to move, that it be printed.

Mr. *Henry Grattan* thought the prayer of this petition was highly honourable to the petitioners. He lamented the difference exhibited on this subject between the independent Corporation of London and the once independent Corporation of Dublin; he must further observe, that the latter would never recover its respectability until it followed the example of the former.

Mr. Alderman *Venables* said, his constituents had requested him to support the prayer of the petition, which he did with great pleasure, for he entirely approved of the new plan of education proposed for Ireland.

Petition to be printed.

Sir *George Murray* presented three petitions from three Presbyteries of Scotland, against the new system of education in Ireland. The petitioners stated, that they felt a deep interest in everything relating to the education of youth in Ireland. The people of Ireland had a right to a religious education of which the proposed plan would deprive them; and they, therefore, prayed that the House would not pass any legislative enactment with a view to force it upon the people of that country. He hoped, that it would not be for one moment supposed that he had swerved from the principles of toleration he had always professed; but, notwithstanding, he continued stedfast in those principles, he concurred with the petitioners in thinking that it was the principle of the Protestants throughout the empire, to have the sacred volume in their possession, and to be instructed from it. The plan proposed by Ministers was erroneous and blameable, in as much as it separated the moral and literary from the religious education of children. It was a great error to suppose that education could thus be divided into two parts; one of which, the State, by this plan, attempted to take under its own protection, while it left the other entirely to itself. This system could not fail to weaken the religious impressions which prevailed at present amongst the humbler classes of society. The Government sought to reconcile principles to each other which were wholly irreconcileable. The Protestant thought that the whole volume should be thrown open to the public, while, on the other hand, the Catholics thought, that the sacred volume should be placed in the hands of their priesthood, and that only as much of it as they chose ought to be given to the public, with such comments as they chose to give with it. It was impossible to reconcile such a wide difference as this. He would not discuss which principle was preferable, for both were liable to abuse. The Catholics might turn the one principle to the injury of the Protestant religion, while the Protestant principle, if carried too far, might tend to weaken amongst the lower classes the respect and regard with which they viewed the Holy Scriptures by teaching them to look upon it as if it were merely a common book. The Catholic principle, on the other hand, even if it did no harm, yet would give to the priesthood of that persuasion a tool to turn to their own advantage. Upon the whole the plan of Ministers appeared to him to be very unlikely to be attended with success and it could not fail to weaken the religious feelings of the community. He was decidedly of opinion that the public money should not be employed in such a scheme. The right hon. Baronet concluded by moving that the petitions be brought up.

Colonel *Conolly* supported the prayer of the petitions. He would call upon that House to prove to him, if they could by any possibility, that the new system was in the smallest degree calculated to act as an improvement upon its predecessor, and that its admission was not likely to produce the most dangerous results and effects in that country. Surely, if that sacred volume were to be put into the hands of the lower classes, with the idea impressed strongly upon their minds that one part of it was proper for them to read and that another part of it was improper for their perusal and for their belief; surely if this were so, he would ask, could a doubt exist in the mind of any man of the evil tendency of such a system. When the question should come before the House, he should take the liberty of urging to the utmost of his abilities the various objections—the almost insurmountable objections he would term them—he had to the plan. He should feel himself called upon to press those opinions upon the House as strongly as his powers would enable him, with a view of inducing either the abolition of such a system, or with the hope that some amelioration might take place in the proposition of the Government. He did consider that no sanction ought to be given to any plan which had for its object the creation of a discussion on religious subjects.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, that the Presbyterians were now all alive to this subject, and without a single exception, he believed, were opposed to it. This was the sixth petition which had been presented to that House, and he expected that all of them would follow the example. The heads of the Presbyterian Church were, he had no hesitation in asserting, the best and most proper judges of the effect which the new plan was likely to produce. It was well known that the Scottish system of education was the best in the world, and it was, therefore, that he contended that the Scotch people were the best judges of that plan which was likely to be productive of the most advantage to the people. This was, to a certain extent, a proposition which would show a disposition to follow in the steps of the Roman Catholics, for the individuals of that religious persuasion were restricted by their priests from the free use of the Bible. He would contend that the more the Scriptures were used the greater the degree of reverence in which they would be held by the lower as well as the higher classes.

Mr. *Pringle* could assure the House the general opinion in Scotland respecting the Ministerial plan was anything but favourable. For his own part he must express his entire concurrence in the opinions contained in the petition.

Petition to be laid on the Table.

Sir *George Murray*, in moving that the petition be printed, merely wished to say that he did not object to the sacred volume being thrown open.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, that the colouring which was given to this new system of religious education, was, in his opinion, very different from that the proposers of the measure gave to it. He denied that the Roman Catholic priests were against the use of the Bible, and he condemned this marshalling of parties against each other on the subject of religion. There ought not to be any objection to a measure which was pregnant with benefits to the people, and calculated to produce the most desirable results.

Mr. *Henry Grattan* was prepared to say, of his own knowledge, that the assertion that the Catholic children were not allowed to read the Bible, whether made in that House, in Exeter Hall, in Scotland, or elsewhere, was false and unfounded. He could take upon himself to say, that most of the Catholics had not only access to the Bible, but were in the habit of reading it. He was surprised that any Member should have the hardihood to make such an assertion.

Sir *George Murray* begged to quote, as his authority for the assertion he had made, and which he requested the hon. Member would peruse—not of course the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, but the hon. member for Downpatrick—a passage contained in a letter written by the right hon. Gentleman, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in which the allegation was made. As to the observations of the hon. Member who spoke last, he should take no notice of them.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* would follow the example of the gallant Officer, and take no notice of the observations of the hon. member for Meath; but whatever statement he made in that House, he should, at the same time, be prepared to substantiate it.

Petition to be printed.

Sir *Robert Inglis* presented a Petition from the clergy, gentry, and inhabitants of Manchester, signed by upwards of 4,000 persons, against the new plan of religious education in Ireland. The petitioners said, they did not so much object to a selection from the Bible, as to a selection which was to exclude the use of the whole volume of the Scriptures. The essence of Protestantism was the Bible, and the whole Bible. Protestantism, therefore, could gain nothing, but might lose much by the substitution of selections from the whole Bible. There was a growing feeling throughout the country on the subject. These petitions, like the others, were signed by several clergymen, not of one, but of numerous denominations of Christians; and, differing as they did, on political subjects, and also on theological points, they were still unanimous in their desire to make the Bible the foundation of education, which they considered essential, and in no instance was it more necessary to disseminate Gospel truths than amongst the common people. It was a subject which became the more important, as by the new system all the support which had formerly been given to the Protestant establishment for education in Ireland had been withdrawn, while the Roman Catholic institutions of a similar description were left untouched. The objections to the new plan were greatly increased by the circumstance that the Roman Catholic was thus to be the only national education in Ireland supported by Government.

Mr. *Sheil* said, he would thank the hon. Baronet who dwelt so much on the use of the entire Bible as the essence of Protestantism for some information on the subject. He begged to ask, whether at the public schools of Westminster and Rugby, the Scriptures were read with so much care and so exclusively as his arguments went to prove? He wished the hon. Baronet would extend his sympathy in this respect to the Aristocracy of England, for he did not believe that at the Universities the Scriptures were greatly attended to. He would ask whether, if a volume were made containing extracts of the Statute-laws now used, the hon. Baronet would say that the use of such a volume amounted to a disuse of the Statutes; besides the hon. Baronet was not quite correct when he asserted that the Roman Catholic was the only system of national education supported by Government in Ireland. The University of Dublin received 40,000*l.* a-year.

Sir *Robert Inglis*, in reply to the question of the hon. and learned Member, said, he could assert that the Scriptures were now duly attended to in the Universities, and the public schools; with respect to the sum of 40,000*l.* a-year received by the University of Dublin, that was altogether distinct from anything the State gave. It was absolute property, in nowise connected with a parliamentary grant, and was as much the property of the University as any property the hon. and learned Member could call his own.

Petition to be printed.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE — SUNDERLAND HARBOUR.] Lord *Stormont* said, that agreeably to the notice which he gave on Friday last, he now rose for the purpose of bringing forward what he conceived to be one of the grossest violations of the privileges of that House of which he had ever heard. In the first place, he wished to correct a statement which had gone abroad, and which seemed to have gained credence, that it was his intention, in bringing this subject forward, to move the Standing Order for the exclusion of strangers. He begged to state, that it never was his intention to take such a course. On the contrary, he had always conceived it to be most desirable that the greatest publicity should be given to those proceedings of the House in which matters of privilege were concerned. The breach of privilege of which he was about to complain arose out of the publication of a letter and of a placard at Sunderland, upon the subject of the proceedings of a Committee of that House which had lately sat up stairs upon a private bill relating to the harbour at Sunderland. After a careful and patient investigation of sixteen days that bill was thrown out by the Committee. The solicitors to the bill, Messrs. John P. Kidson and Joseph John Wright, then wrote a letter to the Harbour Committee at Sunderland, and that letter was printed in a provincial newspaper, and also in placards, and stuck about in different parts of the town. It was of the terms of that letter, and of the manner of its publication, that, in the first place, he complained. He would read it to the House, and then leave hon. Members to decide whether it did not amount to a gross breach of their privileges. It was addressed to the Committee of the Wet Dock, Sunderland. The expressions of the letter, and the statement which it set forth of the divisions of the Committee, constituted, in his opinion, one of the grossest violations of the privileges of that House of which he had ever heard. Could anything be more insulting to the House than for persons to talk of a Bill having been thrown out in consequence of the selfish interests, private wishes, or family connections of any of its Members? But the breach of privilege of which he complained was not confined only to the letter which he had read; there was also another placard published by the same parties, to which he now begged to call the attention of the House. It was exhibited in the streets of Sunderland. The noble Lord then moved that these placards be laid on the Table, and read at length by the Clerk.

They were read accordingly.

Lord *Stormont:* I now beg leave to move that these placards be taken into further consideration on Monday, the 7th of May next.

Mr. *John Hodgson* said, that he had been directed by the solicitors to the bill to state that they had given no direction for the publication of the letter which they sent down to Sunderland, and of the publication of which the noble Lord now complained. While he by no means concurred in the sentiments expressed in that letter, he did not think that it furnished any grounds for proceedings on the part of that House against the writers of it. With respect to that part of the breach of privilege to which the noble Lord had directed the attention of the House, which was comprised in the publication of the divisions of the Committee, he felt that he was himself a party, because it was he who had furnished the information. In justice to himself, however, he must state that he did so in perfect ignorance of its being a breach of privilege. Indeed, if it were thought expedient to publish the divisions of the House itself, it was daily done, he could not conceive why it was not equally as expedient to publish the divisions of its Select Committees.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the publication to which the noble Lord had directed their attention was undoubtedly a gross breach of the privileges of the House, as was also the conduct of his hon. friend behind him, if his own statement were correct. It certainly was not strictly according to the privileges of the House that such information as his hon. friend had furnished should be given for the purposes of publication.

Mr. *Warburton* thought, that if the words of the publications complained of were a little more narrowly, a little more critically observed, it would be seen that they did not apply to the Members of the Committee up-stairs. It was undoubtedly stated that the bill had been thrown out from selfish and private interests, and from family connections; but it did not state that it was owing to the selfish and private interests, or the private connections, of the Members of the Committee.

Mr. *Beaumont* thought that when the whole of the responsibility of publishing the letter was shown to rest with the Wet Dock Committee, the noble Lord ought not to persist in any further proceeding against the printers or the solicitors.

Mr. *Robinson* said, the hon. member for Bridport had entirely overlooked one part of the letter which alluded to a Gentleman who was returned by a constituency interested in the bill, and which held out a threat that his conduct in the Committee would be attended with the loss of his seat. In his opinion, therefore, a grosser breach of privilege never was committed, and he called upon the House not to attend to the extraordinary species of criticism which the hon. member for Bridport had recommended to them.

Ordered that the matter be taken into further consideration on Monday, May 7.

The printers ordered to attend at the Bar of the House on that day.

Lord *Stormont* said, that, as the letter of which he complained was expressly stated to be an official letter, he thought he should be justified in moving that its authors should be brought to the Bar also.

Mr. *Hodgson* repeated his statement, that the letter had been published without the authority of the solicitors by whom it was written.

Sir *George Cockburn* thought, that great blame rested with the solicitors. If, on the throwing out of any private bill, solicitors were to be at liberty so to libel the House, there must be an end to all privilege.

The solicitors ordered to attend at the Bar on May 7th.

CASE OF MR. CURTIN.] Lord Althorp moved that the Order of the Day for the House resolving itself into a Committee of Supply be read,

Mr. *Duncombe* rose, for the purpose of directing the attention of the House to the case of the rev. James Curtin, which he conceived to be one of considerable hardship. In the year 1799, this gentleman, a clergyman of the Church of England, was sent out to the island of Antigua by the Society for the Instruction of Negro Slaves in the Christian Religion, and with the approbation of Dr. Porteous, then Bishop of London. The rev. gentleman proceeded to that island, and succeeded to a benefice there, that of St. Mary's, in 1817, to which he was promoted by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was then Bishop of London. He continued to do his duty as a minister, and as a member of the Society for the Conversion of the Slave Population, down to the autumn of the year 1830, when, in consequence of ill-health, and by virtue of a leave of absence procured from the Bishop of Barbadoes, he came to this country. During the thirty-three years of his residence in Antigua, and down to the hour of his quitting it, he had received many flattering testimonials from the Archbishop of Canterbury and other persons of distinction, of the high estimation in which the zeal and energy with which he discharged the sacred duties of his office was held. During his stay in this country circumstances arose to prevent his return within the period to which his leave of absence was limited. In January, 1832, a correspondence took place between him and the Colonial Office on his petitioning for some temporary employment in Great Britain, the answer to which was, an order to return immediately to the colonies, notwithstanding he had the implied consent of his diocesan for a longer period of leave. Shortly after this, however, Mr. Curtin received another letter from the Colonial Office, telling him, he must proceed forthwith to the colony, to which he replied, on the 7th of February, that he was prevented by bad health from doing so. In the interval of his remaining in this country it happened that an action at law was commenced by a publication called the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, against *Blackwood's Magazine*, for an alleged libel, in which Mr. Curtin was subpœnaed as a witness. That being the case it seemed that steps had been taken to retain him in England, and on the solicitor to the defendant applying to Lord Goderich for Mr. Curtin's leave to be prolonged until after the trial, a letter was written by direction of that nobleman to the solicitors, informing them they might retain Mr. Curtin in England on condition of making good the loss which he would necessarily incur by being absent from his benefice in Antigua. Notwithstanding that letter, extraordinary as it must appear to the House, Mr. Curtin himself received a notice, bearing date the very same day as the letter received by the solicitors, that he must either return at once to Antigua or resign his situation there. He thought that this was a very hard case. Mr. Curtin was now sixty-eight years of age, thirty-three of which he had spent in unwearied exertions to fulfil the duties of his office in a climate little congenial to the health of Englishmen. He was also in a state of uncertainty, in consequence of the extended period of his absence, as to whether his benefice now remained open to him, for such a doubt was implied in one of the communications he had received from the Colonial Office. Therefore, to insist upon his immediate return, while it would deprive Mr. Blackwood of an essential witness, would also, in his (Mr. Duncombe's) opinion, create a bad impression on the public mind, as it would imply a desire to smother all inquiry into the state of the colonies, for Mr. Curtin, from his long residence in the colonies, would be a most important witness, not only in the action now pending, but in an inquiry going forward before that House. All that he asked for, then, was six months additional leave of absence for this gentleman, after which time, if his health permitted, although at so advanced an age, he would not shrink from returning to the discharge of his clerical duties in Antigua. To obtain his object he (Mr. Duncombe) should submit a resolution which, if the noble Lord did not concede, he should certainly take the sense of the House upon. His Resolution was in these terms—"that this House having taken into consideration the case of the rev. James Curtin, Missionary of the Negro Conversion Society, is of opinion that, in consideration of his long and meritorious services in the island of Antigua, and of his services being required in a Court of Justice, his leave of absence be extended six months from this day, without prejudice to his salary."

Lord *Howick* said, that he had heard with extreme astonishment the statement of the hon. Member. The Resolution moved by the hon. Member implied that the House had considered this case; but the House had just as much considered it as the hon. Member appeared to have done, who had not given the shadow of a reason to support such an extraordinary resolution. The defence for the conduct of Lord Goderich which he had to offer was, that he could not act by the existing law otherwise than he had done in this instance. This reverend gentleman came to this country on a leave of absence for six months in the autumn of 1830. According to the existing law, the Bishop of Barbadoes, who had granted this leave, could not give a leave of absence for a longer period than six months, and any extension of that leave could be obtained only by an application to the Colonial Office. Yet, though this gentleman came home in September, 1830, he gave no notice to the Colonial Office of his being in this country until January, 1832, which was more than twelve months after his leave of absence had expired, when he first applied for permission to change his living for one in this country. It was impossible for the Colonial Secretary to comply with such an application, for the Colonial Secretary had no benefices in his disposal except in the colonies. Taking twelve months additional beyond the period of his leave of absence amounted in fact to a resignation of his office, and if any other person but a clergyman was concerned, it would most assuredly be looked upon in that light. This gentleman first applied for an exchange for a living in this country, which was repeatedly refused. His next application was on account of ill-health, but it was not particular or temporary ill-health, and that application was also necessarily refused. He then applied for an additional leave of absence, and at the very same moment that that application reached him (Lord Howick), came a letter from the Solicitor for the periodical publication, against which an action for libel had been brought, applying for permission for the reverend gentleman to remain some additional time in this country. It was not unreasonable under such circumstances, to conclude that there was some collusion between the parties. He had, therefore, written an answer stating, that provided the parties who required Mr. Curtin's evidence, paid his salary during his continuance in this country he might continue, but they declined doing this. He had also written to Mr. Curtin informing him that the grounds which he had stated for a further extension of leave were not sufficient, and that, therefore, he must prepare to return. He again had received on the 13th of February, a letter from Mr. Foss, urging additional leave of absence, on the same ground that he had previously stated. In reply to this, a letter was written, stating, that, by the provisions of an Act of Parliament, the evidence of Mr. Curtin might be taken by interrogatories before the trial; and if this was produced in a Court of Justice, it would be equivalent to his *vivâ voce* evidence. A number of other communications passed between Mr. Curtin and the Colonial Office, in which he continued to urge leave of absence on some ground or another, until at last Lord Goderich wrote to him to say, that, if he intended to retain his living, he must return without delay, as it was impossible to allow a longer leave of absence. The hon. Gentleman said, that Mr. Curtin was treated in a cruel manner; but he forgot that it was in the power of the Bishop to have filled up Mr. Curtin's living on his not returning to his duties. Again, on the 4th of April, Mr. Curtin wrote to ask for a passage out in a King's ship. The answer returned was, that it was the invariable custom for public officers to go out at their own expense. The Colonial Office might, perhaps, be mistaken, but from the way in which these applications were made, and from the manner in which the excuses were given, there certainly was some reason to suspect that they were only excuses given for this gentleman's neglect of the usual mode of obtaining extended leave of absence.

Mr. *Patrick M. Stewart* thought the hon. member for Hertford had made out a very strong case. From what he knew of the circumstances he must contend that there had been no collusion whatever between the party charged with a libel in the magazine and Mr. Curtin, for Mr. Curtin's evidence was of the utmost importance in the case—indeed it would be sufficient to rebut the charge. It happened that the reverend Gentleman was the person who had baptized the woman referred to in the article in question, and could, therefore, give the best evidence on the subject. For the sake of justice, he hoped that the leave of absence of the reverend gentleman would be extended in the manner required. He had been hardly dealt with already, and Government, he thought, ought to grant this request.

Mr. *Burge* said, the regulation adverted to by the noble Lord with respect to the extension of leave of absence must be one of a late date. There were many quite ignorant of it till very recently, and Mr. Curtin might be one of these. If any one was entitled to special indulgence, this gentleman was, for his long and meritorious services. His character in the West Indies stood very high, and under the peculiar circumstances of these colonies, as well as from the importance of the evidence which Mr. Curtin would give to the Committee, it was a matter of importance to the Government itself that he should remain in this country for some time longer, for no man had more deeply studied or was better acquainted with the capabilities of the negro intellect. He, therefore, hoped, that his leave of absence would be extended six months longer.

Sir *Matthew White Ridley* said, that, though, as a private individual, he should wish that a lengthened leave of absence might be given to the reverend gentleman, he could not as a Member of the Legislature, consent that that House should interfere with the Government, in order to grant a leave of absence in direct contradiction to the terms of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. *Duncombe*, in answer to what had fallen from the noble Lord opposite, begged to observe, that if the Bishop had not the power to grant and to renew leave of absence, that right reverend person was in a mistake as to the extent of his power, for it was clear that he imagined he possessed the right which was now denied him. In the first letter he wrote to Mr. Curtin he promised to prolong the leave of absence from time to time; again in a letter of a subsequent date which the reverend gentleman received from the Archdeacon, he expressly stated, that the Bishop hoped that the reverend Gentleman might be able speedily to return to his duties, and of his willingness, in case of actual necessity, to extend the leave of absence to a further period. Besides, an extension of leave in this case could do no injury, for there was a curate doing the duty of the parish, to whom Mr. Curtin paid 50*l.* a year, and who was residing in the parsonage-house. As to what had been stated about the reverend gentleman not having reported himself to the Colonial Office, he believed, that if the noble Lord would take the trouble of looking over the books of the office, he would find that the report had been made, and that Sir George Murray the then Secretary of the Colonies, had done him the honour to enter it in his (Sir G. Murray's) own hand-writing.

Lord *Althorp* was opposed to the Motion. It was quite contrary to the practice of that House to interfere with the Government in granting leave of absence, the proceedings relating to which were governed by the express words of an Act of Parliament. He thought that the residence of clergymen in the colonies was a matter of great importance, and that the rules relating to it ought not to be lightly violated. He was sure that the public opinion was not what the hon. Gentleman opposite imagined; and on the statement of facts which they had heard, there was no one who could say that the conduct of the noble Lord at the head of the Colonial Department had not been strictly warranted by law, or that it was not justified by the necessity of adhering to those rules which had been established with regard to such matters. It was true that Mr. Curtin obtained leave of absence from the Bishop of Barbadoes; that leave was subsequently renewed for six months; but it would be too much to ask for additional leave of absence without any solid reasons. He could easily understand that Mr. Curtin preferred a living in this country to one in the West Indies; but he was equally satisfied that nothing was more requisite upon the part of clergymen than a residence amongst their parishioners. Mr. Curtin was a worthy and a zealous clergyman, and it was that alone which induced his noble friend to overlook his absence from his duty for such a length of time.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* was of opinion, that, under existing circumstances the great age of the reverend gentleman, his length of service, and the importance of his evidence in the case referred to, the Government would not be justified in refusing him a further leave of absence, merely on the ground that, when he first came over to this country, he had not complied with the forms which the Colonial Office required.

Lord *Howick* assured his hon. friend that it was not merely from a want of compliance with the forms of office that caused the suspension of the reverend gentleman, but for staying a whole year in this country without giving notice.

Mr. *Fane* thought the noble Lord had not acted quite candidly when, in the same day he wrote to the reverend gentleman to say he must depart, and to the solicitor for Mr. Blackwood, to say he might stay provided the solicitor was prepared to pay the reverend Gentleman's salary.

The Motion negatived.

CAPTURES BY THE BRAZILIANS.] Mr. *Dixon* begged to call the attention of the House to a subject of great importance, it was connected with the capture of many British vessels by foreign powers, whom the Government had not restrained from such lawless proceedings by resorting to the energetic measures which the circumstances of the case required. In the year 1826, a war existed between the Brazilians and the people of Buenos Ayres, the former blockaded the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, and, under pretence of a breach of the blockade, captured a number of English vessels. The first case to which he begged to call the attention of the House was that of the ship *Caledonia*, on a voyage to Valparaiso. This vessel, when on the coast of Patagonia, was chased and taken possession of by a Buenos-Ayrean privateer. A prize-master and a number of men were put on board and ordered to take the vessel to Buenos Ayres. When the ship came within sight of the Brazilian squadron, the prize-master and his men escaped on shore, leaving the vessel in the possession of the commander. The ship was taken possession of by the Brazilian squadron, carried into Monte Video, and there adjudged to be a prize. It was objected by the Captain that she was a neutral vessel, and had not committed any breach of maritime law which made her liable to seizure; but the capture was held good, on the ground that she had been in the possession of the Buenos-Ayrean privateer. The circumstances of this case were so gross a breach of national faith, that a British ship of war on that station received orders to re-capture the *Caledonia* wherever she might be found. This was done, and, on the Brazilian government's complaining, the Admiralty censured the conduct of the British officer. At the same time, however, notwithstanding the cargo was plundered, and although it had been admitted that according to no principle of international law, could the Brazilian government retain possession of the vessel—no redress had been obtained. The next case was that of the *Unicorn*, which had excited considerable attention: this vessel was captured without the least ground for her seizure. In the Brazils no vessel could be condemned unless on the judgment of the Court of Admiralty at Rio. Now, on the appeal from the Admiralty Court at Monte Video to the Court at Rio, the condemnation of this ship was reversed. He understood the British Consul was told by the Judge of the Admiralty Court at Monte Video that he would not have given the judgment which he did, had he not been under fear of his life. Another vessel, with West India produce on board, was seized by the Brazilian squadron, though there was not the least pretence for saying that she had been guilty of the violation of any orders of blockade. Another vessel, the *George*, was captured in the same manner—with respect to which there had been a decision in one of the Courts of Justice in this country. The case was brought under the consideration of the Court by an action against the insurers, and the Court of Common Pleas decided that the assured was entitled to recover, as the capture had not been occasioned by any misconduct on the part of the Captain. Under these circumstances, how was it that the Government of this country had not interferred to compel the Brazilian government to make some compensation to those British subjects whose property had been thus unjustly seized by the Brazilian squadron? France and the United States of America had compelled the Brazilian government to attend to the claims of their citizens, and had obtained compensation.

The matter had been the subject of negotiation between the government of Brazil and this country; but we had suffered the Brazilians to evade giving proper satisfaction up to that moment for the injuries they had inflicted on British subjects. According to the articles which Lord Ponsonby induced the Brazilian government to assent to, Commissioners were appointed to settle these claims, and the manner in which this was to be done was agreed on. The articles were sufficiently specific, if they had been acted upon; but the truth was, that nothing had been done, and no steps taken to ensure redress. The Government had allowed the Brazilians to evade just demands in a most shameful manner. It would appear as if this country had not the power to protect its subjects from the aggressions of a government like the Brazilian. He understood, that just before the dissolution of the late Government, Lord Aberdeen sent a dispatch to Rio, in which he gave notice, that, if the British claims were not settled without delay, reprisals would be resorted to. That despatch was followed by another, the first of those sent out by the noble Lord, the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in which the same tone appeared to be adopted; but in a very short time afterwards the noble Lord sent out a very different despatch, in consequence of which the threatened reprisals were prevented. He believed it would be said, that this second despatch was sent out because the Brazilian government promised redress, and the Brazilian agent undertook to procure the dismissal of Lisboa. But these promises had not yet been executed, and the noble Lord had suffered British subjects to be denied redress. If what he had stated was correct, as he believed it to be—if the noble Lord really had countermanded the order to make reprisals—the Government was, he must say, much to blame. But there was another subject, on which, in his opinion, the Government had not acted with that strict attention to British interests which was to be expected from them. The mode of paying that sum which the Brazilian government had admitted to be due, was settled to be by forming a sort of debt, the value of which was to be taken in the paper of that government, at sixty-two and half per cent, although the last loan made to that very Government was only valued in the market at forty-five per cent. In this way, therefore, the British merchant, even when his claims were allowed, would find himself still a considerable loser by the means taken to liquidate them. Of course, the persons having claims made them, on the presumption that they should be paid the full amount of the judgments they obtained. But, instead of their receiving the full value for every hundred pounds sterling, they were ordered to receive only at the rate of 750 milrees for 1,000. But, in consequence of the depreciation of the currency, occasioned by a large issue of paper, the 750 milrees were equivalent, in metallic currency, to only 540, or was equal to about 63*l.*, which they were to receive for 100*l.* But, even at that depreciation of thirty-seven per cent, the parties had been unable to obtain a settlement, after a delay of six or seven years. He asked, then, whether the British Government was not prepared to vindicate the national honour, and obtain redress for the merchants who had already lost so much? He was sure, if the Government had acted with the least appearance of energy, that the Brazilian government would have set aside sufficient money for the payment of all these claims. He thought he had made out a strong case, and he hoped that the papers which he was about to move for would be granted, and that the House and the country would be made acquainted with all the circumstances of the case. At the same time, he felt some degree of anxiety as to the explanation which must now be given by the noble Lord, which, he trusted, would be of such a nature as to give satisfaction, and to hold out the prospect of a speedy settlement. He begged leave to move, as an amendment to the Motion for the Speaker leaving the Chair, " that an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, that he will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, ' extracts or copies of all correspondence or despatches that had passed between the Foreign Office and the British Legation at Rio de Janeiro, regarding the seizure and capture of British ships and property by the Brazilian squadron, in the river Plata, in the years 1826-7; also between his Majesty's Consul at Monte Video and the Foreign Office, also, of the correspondence between his Majesty's Consul at Monte Video, and the British Legation at Rio Janeiro; also, extracts or copies of the correspondence that may have passed between the Foreign Office and the Brazilian Legation at this court, on the same subject; together with a copy of the memorandum, dated 5th May, 1829, entered into between Lord Ponsonby and the Brazilian minister for foreign affairs on the same subject."

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* rose to second the Motion of his hon. friend, and to express his feelings of indignation at the conduct which the Brazilian government had pursued towards British subjects. Its proceedings were utterly unwarranted by the laws of nations, or the commonest rules of justice. Several of the British vessels that had been captured had sailed from this country three months before the declaration of war between Brazil and the Buenos-Ayrean government, and yet they had been taken to Rio Janeiro, condemned, and the ships and cargoes sold, for breaking a blockade of which their captains knew nothing till the ships were seized for violating it. There were also some instances of vessels being captured which were not even bound to any port within the territories of Buenos Ayres, much less to the Rio de la Plata. But without going into details it was sufficient for him to refer to the acts of the Brazilian Government itself to expose in its true light the principles of its conduct. The Brazilian legislature had provided for the compensation of British subjects, a decree of the emperor had repealed the condemnation of the vessels seized, and a convention, after a lapse of two years spent in negotiations, was finally obtained, settling the manner in which compensation should be awarded, and providing for the appointment of a mixed commission to carry the convention into effect. Three years had passed since the convention was agreed to, but no decision whatever had been come to by the Commission with respect to the claims referred to it. Was it fit and proper, that the Government of Great Britain should be thus trifled with, and insulted, by such a government as that of the Brazils? What had been the conduct pursued by France and the United States under similar acts of aggression? They had insisted upon reparation under the threat of reprisals, and their claims were immediately allowed. For what purpose had this country a navy which cost 5,000,000*l.* a-year, if such acts of outrage were not to be redressed. He assured the noble Lord, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that this feeling of indignation was general among the mercantile body, and particularly among the merchants of the metropolis, some of whose claims, varying from 5,000*l.* to 25,000*l.*, they had been kept out of for several years, and there even now appeared but little prospect of recovering the money. The Brazilian government had evaded making reparation by every means in its power, and, among the rest, had changed its agent in the course of the discussion, so that much time was wasted in again going over the subject with the new agent. The British Government ought to insist on the agent coming to London, so that he might not be changed at every changing caprice of the government he represented. The government of Buenos Ayres, on which there were similar claims, had done so, and their Commissioners in London had already adjudicated upon a number of cases. Indeed, such was their despatch, that they frequently decided cases in a fortnight. He knew, that the financial state of Brazil might render it difficult for her government at once to satisfy these claims; but it should, at all events, acknowledge their justice. There could be no pretence for withholding this right, for some of the vessels were seized in barefaced violation of every principle of justice. As one instance of this, he must mention, that there was a vessel insured at 8,000*l.*, at Lloyd's, which had been captured by the Brazilian squadron, news of which arrived in this country. The insurers here directed their agent at Brazil to purchase the ship, if it was sold under a certain sum. It was accordingly purchased by him at 2,500*l.* The Brazilian government, however, forced the agent to give up the ship; and he believed that, at this moment, the ship was employed in the transport service of Brazil. He charged the Brazilian government with misconducting itself purely for the purposes of plunder. He was sure that, if the noble Lord would follow the excellent example set him by his predecessor, the Earl of Aberdeen, in the matter of the British claims on the Spanish government, this affair with the Brazils would soon be satisfactorily terminated. It fell to his lot to take an active part in the settlement of the claims he had alluded to, and he should not do the noble Earl justice, if he did not take this opportunity of saying, that he manifested the utmost anxiety and zeal in obtaining redress for the British merchants who had claims upon Spain, for which conduct he had obtained the gratitude of the commercial world. There was another point connected with this subject which he must briefly notice. In 1823, a loan was contracted for by the government of Portugal, with the House of Goldsmid, for a million and a half sterling. By a convention entered into between Portugal and Don Pedro as emperor of the Brazils, the latter took upon himself the payment of this loan; and, in consideration of so doing, Portugal was to surrender certain ports, ships, and warlike stores. In pursuance of this agreement, the Brazilian government paid the interest of the loan to the bondholders for two years. Remittances were sent to pay a dividend due in May, 1828. These were received by the Portuguese minister in London; but when applied to for them on behalf of the bondholders, he said, "No; Don Miguel is now on the throne of Portugal, and the bondholders must look to him for their money." In fact, the Minister wanted this money to apply to the fitting out of his expedition to Terceira; and, from that hour to this, no redress whatever had been afforded the British bondholders. In order to show the feeling which prevailed among British merchants upon this subject, he would take the liberty of reading to the House an extract from a letter written by Mr. Eyre, one of the Committee of the bondholders, on their behalf, to his excellency, the Marquis of St. Amaro, the Brazilian ambassador. Mr. Eyre writes thus:—

"*London, March* 9, 1831.

"Sir—The public papers, I find, have announced, that you have presented your credentials at the Court of London, under which circumstance I now enclose, for your information and that of the government you represent, a copy of a letter which I had the honour to address, on the 21st of February last, to the Chevalier de Mattos, on the subject of the unpaid dividends due on the Portuguese loan, which was assumed by Brazil, by the Treaty of Separation of August, 1825, and, subsequently, inscribed in the Great Book of the Brazils, as a national debt of their own.

"I also now officially transmit you a printed copy of an appeal and protest made on behalf of myself and fellow-sufferers, against the glaring injustice committed towards us; and as the most effectual means of making this known to all concerned, I have caused it to be posted in the Royal Exchange of this city for some days past. Policy and expediency, apart from common honour and honesty, equally call aloud for the most expeditious redress of our grievances, and having now suffered tamely under them for more than three years, it is quite impossible to attribute to us any want of patience or forbearance.

"The attempt to raise a loan for the regency of Terceira, and ostensibly on the security of funds to be received from the Brazils on account of our debt, has, from its very nature, proved abortive; it has been scouted from the British Stock Exchange."

This sufficiently showed the opinion of British merchants with regard to the justice dealt out to them by the Brazilian government. In conclusion, he would express his hope, that the noble Lord, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would speedily take effectual means to obtain for them that redress to which they were entitled and which the interest of the country at large, as well as their individual advantage, required should be obtained.

Viscount *Palmerston* begged to assure the hon. Gentleman who had brought forward the question, that the postponement of his Motion, from time to time, had not been sought, on his part, with any intention of evading it, but simply on account of his being most busily occupied elsewhere. With respect to the Motion itself, it must be obvious that, pending transactions of this sort, to produce every thing stated on one side for the information of another, could not be advantageous to the interests of the parties concerned. He did not stand up in that House to undertake the defence of the Brazilian government in respect of these transactions, for he felt himself bound to say, he considered these captures as made against every principle of national law. It was on that ground that redress had been demanded from the Brazilian government. He was sorry to be obliged to add, that, in the execution of the memorandum which had been referred to as laying down the principles on which redress should be granted, the Brazilian government had not shown that sincere desire to carry that agreement into effect which this country had a right to expect. It was true, as stated by the hon. Member, that the original admission obtained by the late Government from that of the Brazils towards the end of the year 1828—that compensation was due—was obtained by a threat of reprisals in case it were not made, and some proposition laid down to carry it into effect. In consequence of this the memorandum alluded to was drawn up between Lord Ponsonby and the Brazilian government, in the early part of 1829. The hon. Gentleman had truly stated, that when that memorandum came to be carried into execution, and the Commissioners appointed under it came to apply the articles of that memorandum to the cases brought before them, the representatives of this country had reason to complain of delays of all kinds being thrown in the way, and that these delays were not occasioned by a desire to forward the ends of justice, but for the sake of procrastination. The result was, that his predecessor, Lord Aberdeen wrote, towards the end of 1830, to our Chargé d'Affaires at Rio, instructing him to inform the Brazilian government, that the British Government expected a faithful and prompt execution of that agreement; and that, if we had reason to believe the Brazilians acted with bad faith, we should be obliged to have recourse to the measures originally hinted at. When he came into office, in November, he had grounds for considering, that a second communication to the same effect was necessary, in order to advance the progress of the arrangement; and, accordingly, some time in December, he wrote to Mr. Aston in stronger terms than those employed by his predecessor, instructing him to communicate to the Brazilian government, that, if we had cause for supposing that any vexatious delays merely for the purpose of gaining time, and evading the fulfilment of the agreement, were resorted to by the Brazilian Commissioners, Great Britain would have recourse to those reprisals, by which alone justice could be obtained for her subjects. Subsequently to sending off that despatch, he had had a communication with the Marquis of St. Amaro, in which he assured him of the good disposition of the Brazilian government to do what was proper. In consequence of these representations, and the proceedings taken by him, he was induced, towards the end of January, to send Mr. Aston another despatch, instructing him, if he had not already acted upon the instructions contained in his last, to suspend the doing so till he heard again from him. The hon. Member said, that this despatch was the cause of great prejudice to British merchants; but how it could have been so, when, before its arrival, Mr. Aston had already acted upon the contents of its precursor, he was at a loss to imagine. It was clear, that that first communication must have had its full effect before the arrival of the second. The hon. Member talked of the negotiations having been carried on for so long a period; but the fact was, that there were no negotiations at all, after the signature of the memorandum. All that had to be done was, for both sides to appoint Commissioners, as therein agreed upon, in order to apply the principles of the memorandum to the cases brought before them. But then came the revolution of the month of April, by which Don Pedro ceased to be emperor. The change of government which then took place might create delay to a certain unavoidable extent; but he was sorry to say, that greater delay took place than was explicable upon that ground alone. He had, therefore, felt it his duty, towards the close of last year, to repeat the communication he had before made to Mr. Aston, in stronger and more positive terms. Mr. Aston received that communication on or about the 18th of December. It authorized him to state to the Brazilian government, that it was impossible for England to avoid resorting to those measures which her naval superiority placed in her hands, unless the Brazilian government proceeded faithfully in the execution of the memorandum. But, in the meantime, a considerable step had been taken by the Brazilian government to do that which, up to that moment, they had not done, but which was necessary to enable it to pay to British claimants the indemnity that might be awarded there. Towards the end of October, they, for the first time, made a communication to the Brazilian chambers of what had taken place, and the Brazilian chambers passed the vote of credit which the hon. Member had alluded to, placing 300,000*l.* at the disposal of the government, for the satisfaction of these claims, and some unsettled claims of French and American subjects. He was aware that, large as was the amount of this sum, it was not equal to the amount claimed by British merchants; but the principle being thus once admitted, there could be no doubt that, whatever sums might be necessary to satisfy all these claims, would be forthcoming; and, at the date of the last accounts from Mr. Aston, the Commission was proceeding to the investigation of some of the cases before it, the objections which had previously been taken by the Brazilian Commissioners being given up; and there being every reason to suppose, that no improper delay would be again opposed to the settlement of the subject. He was sure the House would feel, that forbearance was especially due from a strong empire like Great Britain, towards a weak power, like the Brazils. There was nothing like equality of maritime strength between them; and Great Britain had it in her power, at any time, to have recourse to force to obtain redress. In such a case more forbearance was due than might be, were the forces of the two parties approaching nearer to an equality. It had not been from any feeling of indifference to these claims that our greater power had not been asserted; but from a desire to abstain from having recourse to forcible means, so long as there appeared a possibility of obtaining redress by any others. He was not sorry, that this Motion had been made; nor could he have the slightest wish to prevent its being brought forward for it could not be useless that the Brazilian government should understand, that if our communications to them had borne a character which made them, in their address to their chambers describe us as "the most imperative of friendly nations" —it could not be useless that they should know, that, if we had been urgent in our demands, it was not because the Executive Government preferred that mode of communication, but that the House of Commons, even if the Government should be neglectful of its duty, would interpose, to see, that justice was finally done. In the present state of these transactions, then, having no reason to believe, that the Brazilian government was not now disposed to take the right steps to have these claims properly investigated, and feeling that the correspondence moved for by the hon. Gentleman would not be useful for his purpose; but, on the contrary, inconvenient to be produced, he must request the House not to consent to this motion. The hon. Gentleman had expressed a hope, that the Government would not consent to any modification or change of the terms of the memorandum. He might state, that application was made to him, to reconsider that memorandum; but it was impossible to do so—it was a binding engagement between the two countries, and that, whilst we, on the one hand, could not ask for more than that memorandum gave us, so, on the other, we were entitled to every [thing it did give us. He was aware, that with respect to the question of the exchanges, time had produced an alteration in the working of the article which regarded them; but, he still thought, upon the whole, that memorandum contained just and equitable principles for the settlement of these claims, and he should certainly conceive it to be his duty to require it to be executed as it now stood.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that his noble friend (Lord Palmerston) had observed, with some semblance of justice, that, in disputes between a strong and a weaker nation, forbearance ought to be shown towards the latter. That did not, however, appear to be the principle which the House was willing to recognise in the case of Portugal, for there appeared to be on the part of the majority which upon a late occasion had refused papers explanatory of our relations with Portugal, a disposition to censure Lord Aberdeen, because he had allowed thirty or forty days to elapse before he proceeded to exact justice by force for wrongs alleged to have been done to British subjects. Admitting, however, this principle of forbearance to be just, as it was generous, he thought the time had long expired, during which forbearance could with either prudence or justice be extended towards the Brazils. If the true history of the transactions in which British property had not merely been mistakenly seized and confiscated, but in his conscience he believed designedly plundered, were laid before the House of Commons, they would not hesitate to declare, that the period had arrived when the Government ought no longer to delay exacting reparation for the injuries and insolence which had so long remained unredressed. He must say, that those injuries had been much underrated by the two hon. Members who had brought forward and supported the Motion. The true history was this:—There was a war between the governments of Brazil and of Buenos Ayres, and a blockade of the ports of Buenos Ayres was proclaimed. It was, however, but a paper blockade, there being obviously no adequate power to enforce it. Under these circumstances, the principle laid down by the government of Brazil was this, that no vessel should be held responsible for breach of the blockade to which previous notice of the blockade had not been regularly given. In utter disregard of this principle established by Brazil itself, and without an adequate force to maintain a real blockade, several British vessels were seized upon by Brazilian cruisers, and confiscated, to the value, he believed, of 500,000*l.* An attempt had been actually made, on the part of the Brazilian government to draw a distinction between the French and Americans and the English, and to act upon the absurd doctrine that the British had no right to that warning which it was admitted was due to the vessels of those other Powers. Seizures took place in 1826 and 1827, founded on this unjust and ridiculous distinction, before his noble friend, the Duke of Wellington, came into office. Shortly after that event, his noble friend, Lord Aberdeen, wrote to the British minister at Rio, stating, that the injuries thus sustained by England were so monstrous, their injustice so glaring, the partiality attempted to be shown to the governments of other countries so indefensible, that, unless the government of the Brazils promised immediate reparation for the injustice which had been done in the cases of four particular vessels (which were named), the British Admiral on that station would, within the lapse of thirty days, proceed to immediate reprisals. The names of these four vessels were, the *John*, the *George*, the *Henry and Isabella*, and the *Coquette*. These vessels were seized against all law and all justice, and law and justice were prostituted by their condemnation by the Vice-Admiralty Courts of Rio. The British Minister thought the reparation so incomplete, that that minister, Lord Ponsonby, a nobleman who enjoyed the full confidence of the present Government, did not confine his claim for compensation to these four particular vessels; but threatened reprisals, unless the whole sum of 474,000*l.* was immediately paid down by the government of the Brazils. The hon. Member who brought forward the present Motion blamed the Government for its conduct in the case of a vessel called the *Nestor*, which had been seized by British ships from the Brazilians, but was afterwards restored. If a person was not acquainted with the facts, it was very natural for him to think that the British Government was wrong in directing that vessel to be restored, until the compensation claimed on account of losses sustained by other British subjects was paid. But if the *Nestor* was seized by a British cruizer, contrary to the law of nations, the British Government, in his opinion, acted justly in directing restitution to be made. The case had been submitted to the King's Advocate, and his opinion was, that it was not competent for the British squadron consistently with the law of nations, to take forcible possession of the *Nestor*, while she was under the jurisdiction of a Vice Admiralty Court. The British Government in effect said—whatever injury our merchants have sustained, we will not obtain redress by unauthorized and illegal means—we will not consent to be unjust ourselves as a set off against previous injustice. If the King's Advocate was right in his law, of which he (Sir Robert Peel) entertained no doubt, our claims for redress were fortified, by setting an example of strict obedience to the laws of nations. The hon. Alderman who had seconded the Motion seemed to imagine, that the French and Americans had demanded immediate reparation, while this country had postponed the enforcement of her claims until after an inquiry had been made by a mixed commission—but the fact was, that the course taken by the three Governments was precisely the same. If the new government established in the Brazils had been ignorant of the principles of the law of nations, if these injuries had been inflicted through inadvertence, the *novitas regni*, the newness of their authority might have been pleaded as some excuse, but that was not the case. From what he knew of the transaction, he must say, that it was anything but creditable to the Emperor. There was ground for grave suspicion that these vessels were wilfully seized, against the advice of the Emperor's ministers, by the Brazilian Admiral, who happened to have more influence with the Emperor than they had. With regard to the *Hellespont*, a vessel seized and detained for adjudication, it was plundered, before the period of adjudication had arrived, to such an extent that it was no longer possible to restore it to its owner, possessing the same value. His noble friend had told them that at length there was some prospect of a settlement. He was happy to hear that they were at least to derive some advantage from the recent revolution in the government of Brazil, and that the existing government had a greater disposition to afford redress than the government of him under whom these atrocities against British property had been committed. And this Don Pedro, under whose sanction and by whose contrivance it was gravely suspected these enormities had been perpetrated, this was the man whom his Majesty's Government had permitted to trample upon the municipal laws of England—to recruit British soldiers upon the British territory—who was even now, as it was ostentatiously reported, at the head of a British battalion at Terceira, and under whose banners an officer holding the King's commission was allowed to lead on a British force against Portugal. He should like to know what injustice Portugal had been guilty of, what injuries she had inflicted on us, which could be compared with those he had described? What insults had we experienced from Don Miguel equal to those offered to British subjects, and through them to the British nation, by Don Pedro? What infatuation was it that led his Majesty's Ministers to lend their countenance to that individual in his project upon Portugal? If the people of Portugal decided in favour of the claims of Don Miguel to the crown, nay, if they acquiesced in his rule, preferring it to that of Don Pedro or Donna Maria, he could not see upon what principles, consistently with the independence and integrity of nations, this country or its Ministers could lend their names to the contest. He did not stand there to defend Don Miguel, but his belief was, that Portugal preferred Don Miguel to Don Pedro, and in that case he could not but entertain a deep sense of the injury done to Portugal by the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers. If Miguel was the choice of the Portuguese nation, what better claim, he wished to know, had Louis Phillippe to the throne of France than Miguel to the throne of Portugal? Was it that the people in the latter country shewed symptoms of dissatisfaction in occasional commotions? Was not that the case in France also? And upon what pretence, then, did the Government allow British officers to join the hostile expedition of Don Pedro? Why not issue an order of recal for all British officers engaged in such an enterprise? The truth was, that this expedition was an attack upon the independence of Portugal on the part of France and England, for it never could have been prepared without their countenance and assistance. It might succeed through the agency of British valour, and in consequence of the permitted violation of our municipal laws; but by what policy the British Government was actuated in allowing British officers to enlist under the banners of either party he could not understand. To complete the folly of our conduct, this enterprise, by which civil war was to be introduced into the Peninsula, was fitted out by the money due in the form of dividends to the British creditors of the Brazilian state. He knew that his Majesty's Ministers would answer that it was not in their power to interfere. But he denied the validity of that excuse. Suppose that Charles 10th, or a party attached to Charles 10th, had hired armed ships and levied men for an expedition against France, did his Majesty's Ministers mean to say, that they would not have exercised their power to prevent such proceedings? If neutrality was a duty in the one case, it was in the other, and it was no answer to allege, that France was a powerful country and that Portugal was not. It was not Portugal alone, he feared, that was concerned in this question. The peace of Spain was endangered. He must say, that, of all foreign countries, he had seen none more disposed of late years to draw closely the bonds of amity with this country than Spain. He believed that she was well aware that her true interests would be promoted by a strict union upon honourable terms with this country. For the last seven years she had shown a disposition to listen to the reasonable proposals of this country; and if the late Government had continued in office, he had little doubt that, by this time, she would have consented to recognise the independence of the South American states. In her pecuniary dealings with this country Spain had been conspicuously honourable. She had paid money, the hope of the payment of which Mr. Canning had treated as little better than a dream of insanity. And yet we were to be the parties by whose agency Spain was to be convulsed by the renewal of civil dissentions. We were about to endanger her internal peace, by lending our sanction to a foreign expedition, in contradiction to our professions of neutrality and our boast of non-intervention.

Mr. *Robinson* said, he had heard the statement of the noble Lord with much regret, for he believed, from what had fallen from the noble Lord that Government did not entertain any idea of following the matter up with more vigour than it had hitherto displayed, for the purpose of showing the Brazilian government that Great Britain would no longer submit to evasion and procrastination. He must remind the

House that a different plan had been pursued with regard to Portugal; a squadron was sent to the Tagus, and immediate reparation demanded and enforced, while in the case of the Brazils, the noble Lord had satisfied himself with making ineffectual remonstrances. The noble Lord said, that, on coming into office, he was so convinced that there had been improper delay in settling these claims, that he sent to Mr. Aston, at Rio, enforcing the orders of his predecessor, but that he was afterwards induced, in consequence of the remonstrances of the Brazilian ambassador, to desire him not to act upon that letter. The noble Lord further said, that the first letter was communicated to the Brazilian government before the arrival of the second, but he took it for granted, that, in consequence of the arrival of the latter, the tone of the former was not followed up. He recollected, on a former occasion, that the noble Lord had taken great credit to himself because Lord Aberdeen had held out a threat to Portugal, which was not followed up, whilst he sent a squadron to the Tagus and obtained satisfaction; but how was it that he had not pursued the same course with regard to the Brazils? There was a want of firmness of purpose about the foreign policy of Government, according to the received opinion amongst British merchants, which placed them under a great disadvantage in foreign countries. He disliked any thing in the shape of tortuous policy, and he hoped, therefore, that Government would fix a period, after which reprisals would be made, unless satisfaction were given within the time. It was within our reach to do so, for the Brazils was a commercial country, so that at any time we might have recourse to reprisals. He thought it most nefarious that money sent to this country from the Brazils, to pay the interest of the loan, should be appropriated to another purpose by the Brazilian authorities in London. As the noble Lord had taken no notice of this part of the subject, as propounded by the hon. Member who introduced the Motion, and the worthy Alderman who had seconded it, he trusted the debate would not close without the noble Lord giving some reply, calculated to satisfy those persons who had suffered from so scandalous a proceeding.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, that he had become acquainted with the papers relating to this case, and his opinion was, that it ought to have been settled long since. He could not see any reason why the claims of Great Britain should be postponed to those of France and the United States, who had both successfully urged their respective claims. It was with much regret and surprise that he heard of any relaxation of the just demand of Great Britain, for no man could doubt that such relaxation would lead to consequences most injurious to our commercial and maritime interests. He was at a loss to know why the British flag, with all its rights and all its attributes, should be treated in the South American seas with less respect than the flag of any other nation. The only mode, however, of getting reparation from states was, by representation to the government, not by resorting to similar piratical acts, and therefore, he approved of the restoration of the ship *Nestor*. If Great Britain had the magnanimity to release the vessels which had been seized, she ought still to insist upon retribution and compensation. He wished to ask the noble Lord whether he had fixed a period for the adjustment of these claims, beyond which other means would be called into action to vindicate the honour of the British flag. The merchants of London had had abundant reason already to complain of the delay, and unless the noble Lord stated some period when justice was to be done, he should recommend an address to his Majesty, praying him to take measures for insisting on retribution.

Lord *Althorp* was perfectly willing to admit that the acts complained of were most grossly unjust, and wholly unjustifiable on the part of the Brazilian government. The late Administration had two courses to pursue, namely, to send a squadron and make reprisals, or, (which was the course they did take) to call on the Brazilian government for redress, and threaten reprisals if it was refused. He considered that the late Administration was wise in what they did, in giving the Brazilian government an opportunity to make reparation. The case was not one of absolute refusal, but unnecessary delays had been interposed; and, as his noble friend had stated, instructions had been sent to our Minister in the Brazils, to communicate to the government that, unless those delays were put an end to, reprisals would be resorted to; and, in consequence, the cases were in a course of adjustment. He did not see how we could act otherwise than to declare that, if we saw any unnecessary delays interposed, we should resort to reprisals, and this was the course Government were determined to adopt.

Mr. *Ewart* hoped that the noble Lord would act up to his declaration, and not suffer these claims to stand over indefinitely, but exact all he could from the Brazilian government, and vindicate the national honour. He could assure the Ministers that there was a very strong feeling in the mercantile classes that a great deal too much forbearance had already taken place in entering into prolonged negotiations upon such manifest acts of injustice.

Sir *Frederick Trench* said, that the French and the North Americans had very speedily obtained redress; even the Swedes, who had a claim for a few thousand dollars, had sent a vessel of war to enforce their demand, and had thereby received satisfaction, but British claimants were ridiculed in their attempts to enforce it, and British diplomacy was the jest of the South American States. He did hope that one effect of this discussion would be, to induce Government to adopt a more decided tone.

Lord *Morpeth* said, that he had a petition to present from merchants at Leeds, who stated, that they suffered great distress through the indefinite delay of the adjustment of their claims. He admired the promptitude with which his noble friend, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, had acted in reference to Portugal, and hoped he would exercise in the new world a little of that energy which he displayed in the old.

Lord *Sandon* said, that a great portion of the claims were made by his constituents, and he did hope that his Majesty's Government would give them the protection and support to which they were entitled. He should like to hear that the noble Lord was prepared to assign a specific time for the adjustment of the claims, beyond which frivolous and vexatious delays should no longer be tolerated. Other states of the new world were imitating the conduct of the Brazilian and Buenos-Ayrean, and preying upon British commerce; and the only way to put a stop to such outrages was, to repress them at the outset with a firm hand.

Mr. *Hume* called upon the Government to act upon the memorandum which had been suffered to lie unheeded by the Brazilian government for three years. As far as his information went, the noble Lord was not correctly instructed, for not one case had yet been adjudicated. He regretted that English merchants should be so treated. The British flag, which was once respected in all parts of the world, was now mocked every where. He, therefore, considered the question was of much greater importance than the noble Lord seemed to consider it, and to allow such unjust acts to be committed with impunity was a disgrace to the Government.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* really thought it time that his Majesty's Government should make some answer to the charges brought against them. It had been stated in that House that the country had been disgraced, that it had been made a subject of ridicule, and that it had become a laughing stock to the whole of Europe; and these statements had all come from Members usually supporting the Government: and it was not only in the failure of his Majesty's Government to protect the rights of British subjects that they had rendered themselves thus obnoxious to complaint, for, while this had been done, others of his Majesty's subjects had been allowed to join an army for the purpose of making war upon a friendly power and ally of this country. He wished to ask the noble Lord, whether any steps had been taken to recal those officers of the army and navy who had joined the armament for the invasion of Portugal?

Colonel *Evans* said, that, if the interference of officers on one side was a matter for interference, he should like to know whether the Government ought not also to take notice of the well-known fact that a noble Lord in his Majesty's service was now directing the operations of Don Miguel? He should like to know whether the right hon. Baronet, the member for Tamworth, meant, that the Government ought to send out an expedition to prevent the expedition of Don Pedro from attacking Portugal.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, he did not state to the House any thing which he thought the House would not have clearly understood. He had not spoken upon vague newspaper reports: he had seen the names of British officers affixed to proclamations issued under the authority of Don Pedro, and, as such conduct was in direct violation of the statute, he thought the Government ought at once to interfere, and to remove all such officers.

Viscount *Palmerston* had not expected

this sort of discussion on the merits of the contest between Don Miguel and Don Pedro. In reply to the question of the right hon. and gallant member, he could only say, that there was a person in Don Pedro's service who was formerly an officer in the British navy, but he no longer held a commission in the service. If there were any military officers in Don Pedro's service the same rule applied to them. It certainly was against the statute for British officers to serve in foreign fleets or armies. It might not be right for any Englishman to do so, but, how was it to be prevented? Admiral Brown and others who were in the South-American service prior to the recognition of the New States, had not been recalled, and could not be, for they had no commissions, and the Government had no power over them. But it was said, that the Government behaved different in the case of France—that King Phillippe received different treatment; but in that they had only followed the example of their predecessors. Did not King Phillippe receive different treatment from the late Government? Was not he acknowledged, and Don Miguel treated as an usurper? He thought the course pursued was the only fair one. His Majesty's Government had observed a strict neutrality. With respect to the alleged insults and mockery of the British flag, he had no knowledge of the grounds on which the statements had been made. His noble friend had correctly stated, that the cases were in a course of investigation. The case of the *Henry and Isabella* was under adjudication when the last advices came away. He only asked the House to have so much confidence in the Government as to believe it would use the best means it could, and would not shrink from the discharge of its acknowlodged duty, either to obtain adequate remuneration for property unjustly seized, or to repress outrage by whomsoever practised.

Sir *Robert Peel* was satisfied, from the statement, that the production of the papers would be injurious to the claims of the parties, and he thought the noble Lord ought not to be called upon to state at what period the payments were to commence. After the declarations of the two noble Lords connected with the Government, it would be well to leave the matter in their hands, and he suggested to the hon. Member that the best course he could pursue would be, to withdraw the Motion.

Sir *John M. Doyle* remarked, that, were it not that he conceived it would be derogatory to a British Member of Parliament to become an informer, he should have much pleasure in answering the question put by his much-respected friend, the right hon. General opposite, to his gallant friend at this side of the House. As to British officers serving in the army of the usurper, Miguel, he could hardly conceive it possible that his right hon. friend, and some of those hon. Members who sat near him, could be in ignorance of the fact; he also begged leave to state that a British officer on half-pay, and who served on the staff in Portugal, and now in the military service of Miguel, was, at this moment, a diplomatic agent in London, and had been so employed for months past: of course, he forgot the name of this respectable individual.

Motion withdrawn.

House went into Committee of Supply.

Ordnance estimates postponed.

House resumed.

ARREAR OF TITHES (IRELAND.)] Mr. Stanley moved the third reading of the Tithe Bill.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, he hoped to hear some better arguments in favour of this Bill, on the third reading, than had yet been urged in its behalf. From all he had seen and heard, he was convinced that a cessation from agitation and excitement would be most desirable and beneficial for Ireland; that cessation, however, it would never obtain if this Bill passed into a law. Every account only tended to show that the people were opposed to this impost as being most unjust, unequal, and oppressive; and, if hon. Gentlemen thought, that, by severity and harshness, they could put down the opposition to the payment of tithes, they would find themselves much mistaken. The people considered themselves insulted by the introduction of such a Bill as this during the progress of the great measure of Parliamentary Reform. They felt and knew that this Bill was inefficient. It excited the ill-will of the country at present, and held out no hope whatever for the future. He did trust, therefore, that Ministers would reconsider the question, and pause before they endeavoured to carry into effect enactments that could not be sustained by any established law, but which had been merely brought forward to meet the passing necessity of the moment. His main objections to the Bill were, that it left the general question untouched, and merely provided for one year; and that it was most obnoxious to the people of Ireland. Some Gentlemen might be induced, by the necessity of the case, to vote for the measure; and he had no doubt that, in doing so, they were acting conscientiously. Had it been proposed to extend general relief to the people of Ireland, he was sure there was no one in the House who would object to supplying Government with the means. But, could any one conceive that the disgusting and insulting provisions of this Bill, which were to be followed up by half-martial law, would be productive of peace or harmony in Ireland? He trusted hon. Gentlemen would not, for the sake of their own credit, and for the sake of the credit of this Parliament, consent to pass such a law as this; if they did, he told them it would not work well. Some advocated the adoption of rigorous measures—some were in favour of conciliation—but both parties joined in opposing this measure; which, instead of uniting and dispelling hostile feelings, would only give rise to new sources of discontent. The present system of tithes was universally admitted to require some amendment; and when the people first heard of extinction, they eagerly grasped at it, because they were ignorant of the wide distinction between extinction and abolition. The people of Ireland were not in a state to be easily satisfied. There was no common feeling between the governors and the governed; the people were dissatisfied with a system which drove them to desperation; and could it be supposed that they would be tranquillized by such a measure as this? There was no man more anxious to preserve the union between the two countries than he was, but he knew that many who were formerly decidedly opposed to a repeal of the Union, now looked at the question in a different point of view. He believed those who were the best friends to the two countries were opposed to keeping Ireland in the invidious situation in which she was now placed. There was a growing feeling in Ireland that was hopeless unless some change took place in their domestic Legislature. The people of Ireland would be tranquillized if some prospect of relief were held out to them, and yet they could have no kind, soothing, word from Parliament. Under this ungracious mode of treatment, they never could be satisfied. Rigorous measures and martial law could only tend to increase their discontent, and, therefore, he gave his determined opposition to this measure.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* had already stated his opinions on this question, and did not think it necessary at any length to reiterate his objections to the principle of the Bill. He was free to admit, that, as a coercive measure, the Bill was as lenient as could be expected; but what he objected to was, that any coercive measure should be forced upon the people, unless, at the same time, that measure were accompanied by a measure of relief. He gave the right hon. Gentleman credit for the very best intentions in introducing this measure; but he certainly was bound to say, that the right hon. Gentleman was acting under a very gross delusion. That Bill would be found inefficient. It would not be in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to enforce that law, because it was a bad law, and because it was a law which was condemned by the public voice, and repudiated by the public feeling of the country. Unjust laws were mere waste parchment. They could not operate, and, if it was attempted to enforce them by penalties, it could not be done unless by constant collision with the people. He again admitted that, as a measure of coercion, the Bill was as lenient as it possibly could be; but it was just cause of complaint, that a measure of coercion should be forced upon the public, despite of every pledge that there should be no coercive measure unattended by the removal of the grievance complained of. Having said thus much, he did not intend to trespass further upon the attention of the House. He had opposed the Bill all through, but he did not conceive it necessary to offer any further fruitless opposition.

Mr. *Petre* said, that he could not but condemn the course which had been taken in opposition to this Bill, which he thought so fair and reasonable as to be entitled to every fair and proper support. He denied that the members of the Catholic religion were actuated by a wish to overthrow the Church Establishment in Ireland. He was a Catholic, and he felt bound by the oath he took, when coming into that House, to support the Protestant Establishment. He considered the Establishment of the Protestant Church as part and parcel of the Government of the country; and, as a Catholic, he felt himself bound, by the oath he had taken when coming into that House, not to do anything calculated to overthrow the Protestant Church. He was returned to that House by an almost exclusively Protestant constituency, and he considered that he should be guilty of the greatest ingratitude to them if he could be capable of joining in the unjust and unreasonable resistance given to this Bill. Looking to the oath taken by Catholic Members in coming into the House, he must contend that the conditions of that solemn obligation bound them to resist any attempt to overthrow the temporalities of the Established Church. So far as he could understand the question, the present Bill appeared to him a mild and lenient Bill. A combination existed against the rights of property in Ireland, and was it to be told to the Government that they were not to interfere and vindicate the law. It was not now a question as to the merit of any existing law; if the law was bad, that House was the proper place to have it amended. But he did not think that the people had a right to take the law into their own hands, and say they would not obey the law? He thought that it was the duty of every Member of that House to support his Majesty's Government in upholding the authority of the law, and vindicating its power. He had felt it to be his duty to use these words for the purpose of repelling the imputations as unjust, that the Catholic Members of that House felt inimical to the Established Church. If he had acted otherwise, he should be ungrateful to a Protestant constituency, who returned him to that House—and, more than that, he should be ungrateful to the Protestant Legislature, which relieved him from his civil disabilities, and rendered him eligible to a seat in that House. He had felt bound to say thus much, and he certainly was surprised at the unreasonable perseverance with which hon. Members continued to oppose this measure.

Mr. *Sheil* said, that the hon. member for Ilchester (Mr. Petre) was an English, and that he was an Irish, Catholic. They were animals of a different genus, though they had been in the same cage. The member for Ilchester confided in the Government—he confided in the power and determination of his countrymen. The hon. Gentleman was grateful to English Protestants for his enfranchisement—he might have extended his gratitude, and felt that he owed some thanks to the virtue and the energy of the Irish millions who knew and who proved that—"Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow." Ireland, for her freedom, had to thank herself; and from what he had observed, he felt convinced, that it would be to herself that she would owe the removal of her remaining grievances. He had risen to protest against this Bill, and against the construction of the Catholic oath given by an English Catholic, who had applied his political habits to his interpretation. First, as to the Bill, it was a piece of preposterous legislation, while Reform would give a giant's strength to Ireland, the Tithe Bill would prompt her to use it in a gigantic fashion—it was like striking a man a blow in the face, while you put a club into his hands. At the next election, the people would seek for candidates for Parliament among martyrs to tithes. Newgate would be the avenue to St. Stephen's Chapel, and Government would, by irritating the people, reverse the saying of Mirabeau, and prove that there was but a single bound to be made from the foot of the Tarpeian rock to the summit of the capitol. They must grant Reform to Ireland—they would not presume to withhold it—talk, indeed, of abolishing fifty-six close boroughs in England, and of leaving the pay of twenty boroughs in the sordid hands of the provincial oligarchy of Ireland! It might be incommodious for Government to hear, at this moment, a reference made to their former pledges on the Church; but they had, themselves, forced these topics into discussion, by bringing forward their tithe Bill, pending Reform in the Lords, while they were embarrassed, and their virtue was bound to the ground by those small Lilliputian ligatures and constraints which prevented them from standing up. The Catholic oath had been referred to. That oath bound a Catholic not to *subvert* (that was the word) the Church, nor weaken the Protestant religion. Was the reduction of the revenues of the Church equivalent to its subversion? The meaning of the oath, perhaps, should be collected from the rejection of Mr. Wilmot Horton's motion to prevent Catholics from voting in ecclesiastical matters. There was in

Scotland an Established Church—a cheap and useful institution, agreeable to the feelings, and not burthensome to the resources of the people. Will you lay the Irish Church in ruins by bringing it on a level with that Establishment, whose simple front and plain fabric is built on the principles of apostolic architecture? As to weakening the Protestant religion, he trusted that it consisted in something better than vast episcopal territories, numerous sinecurism, bloated pluralities, offensive rates, insulting cesses, pulpits occupied with cobwebs, altars encompassed with loneliness, and churches with clerks for a congregation. The creed of Irish Protestantism was to him matter of indifference; but the coffers of Irish Protestantism were a public and political concern; and so far from the religion being impaired by the diminution of its revenues, it would, on the contrary, be relieved from those obstacles which were opposed to its progress by its pecuniary abuses causing national detestation. These sentiments might be unpalatable to a Reforming Parliament; but a Reformed Parliament was at hand, and it would have a different relish. It was of little consequence how these opinions were received in that assembly. It had given itself a suicidal stab—it had declared itself unworthy of the Offices of Legislation, and it was to its successor that he should look for that great work of ecclesiastical regeneration, which was indispensable to the peace, tranquillity, and ultimate safety, of Ireland.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that the course which the debate had taken was so entirely foreign from the matter under discussion, that he would not have troubled the House at present, were it not that he felt bound to offer a few remarks on that most extraordinary piece of most extraordinary declamation with which the House had been favoured by the hon. Member who had just sat down. He did not think it necessary to vindicate his hon. friend, the member for Ilchester, from the imputations indirectly cast upon him; any one who witnessed his plain and straightforward, and manly and unequivocal manner, must feel convinced how infinitely superior the course his hon. friend took was, to what he should not hesitate to call the flimsy and hollow casuistry—the quibbling sophistry—which had, under cover, no doubt of elegant language and brilliant imagination, been used to attack his hon. friend, by the hon. member for Louth. His hon. friend, the member for Ilchester, had pursued an honest, manly, straightforward course—he unequivocally declared, that he felt bound by the ties of duty and honour—by the sense of gratitude to Government—by his duty to his country and by his duty to his God, not to use, to the injury or the destruction of the Protestant establishment, powers vested in him by an exclusively Protestant Legislature. How different was this from the casuistry which had been resorted to by the hon. and learned member for Louth, who denied that the obligation of this oath was so felt or understood by the Catholic Members of that House. What, said the hon. and learned Member, "You must permit us to be the auditors of our own accounts." Did the hon. and learned Member, then, mean to make good the charge that had been urged against that oath by the opponents of Catholic emancipation, and which he and others of its advocates indignantly denied? Did he then admit that the oath was taken, in the solemn presence of his God, with a mental reservation, and not according to the meaning of those by whom that oath was administered? In the terms of that oath, he who takes it is supposed to do so without mental reservation or equivocation; and, when the hon. and learned Member talked of being the auditors of their own accounts, he would be glad to ask, what did the hon. and learned Gentleman mean by that expression, unless it was, that this oath was taken with mental reservation, and not in the meaning of those by whom it was administered? What else than this was the meaning "that they were the auditors of their own accounts?" Did the hon. and learned Gentleman mean to say, that those who took the oath were to be the judges of its meaning, and not those who administered it?

Mr. *Sheil* begged to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, as he was arguing upon an expression which he had never used. What he said was directly the reverse of what was stated by the right hon. Gentleman. He had contended that the oath was taken in the exact meaning of those who administered it; but that so taken, it did not bear the interpretation put upon it by the hon. member for Ilchester. His reference to the motion of Mr. Wilmot Horton had been adopted merely for the purpose of illustrating the argument he was urging.

Mr. *Stanley* resumed—He should be the last person that should wish to interrupt any hon. Gentleman from setting him right, whenever there could be a possibility of his mistaking any expression of such hon. Gentleman. However, in the present instance, he had taken down the exact words made use of by the hon. and learned Gentleman. He certainly thought that they bore the construction which he affixed to them. An oath was not a matter of honour ; it was a solemn obligation between two contracting parties ; and either party had the full right to claim the fulfilment of that oath. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to a motion made by an hon. friend of his (Mr. Stanley's) at the time of the Catholic question. At that time he condemned that motion as unjust, unreasonable, and unnecessary ; but, certainly, the explanations and assertions indulged in by the hon. and learned member for Louth, had gone far to shake his confidence in the opinions he then entertained. The hon. and learned Member had argued the question with a great deal of casuistry ; but what was the meaning of the terms of the oath ?—that he would defend, to the utmost of his power, the rights of the Protestant Church, as by law established ; and the oath goes on—" And I hereby abjure any intention to subvert the Protestant religion."—No ; to subvert the Protestant Church.—No ; but " to subvert the Protestant Church-establishment, as settled by law." The hon. and learned Member, with all his eloquence and all his casuistry, must not tell him that the Protestant religion or the Protestant Church were synonymous with the Protestant Church-establishment as settled by law. The hon. and learned Gentleman's construction of that oath ran counter to the intentions of those by whom that oath was framed, and who admitted the hon. Member and his friends to a seat in that House. The whole of the hon. and learned Gentleman's casuistry amounted to this : " I may destroy three-fourths of the property of the Established Church in Ireland ; my oath binds me not to destroy the property of the Protestant Church ; but, as long as there is a fractional part left remaining—as long as I don't destroy the entire property of the Established Church, so long I do not violate my oath." He would not now stop to argue whether any gratitude was due to the people of England for their support of that measure which gave to the hon. and learned Gentleman a seat in that House. He would not ask, whether any share of gratitude was due to those who, for struggling in that cause, had endured the fatigue of that strife, and who, night after night, had perseveringly continued in that House, and assisted in giving the crowning stroke to that great measure. He did not mean to deny, whatever portion of the merit was due to those who, by the persevering agitation of this question, had at length succeeded in forcing it on the attention of an unwilling Government; but, whatever share of advantage might have resulted from that measure, it was not to be reaped without the intermixture of some of those noxious weeds which shoot up amidst the most luxuriant soils, and of which they were now reaping the bitter fruits in the fulness of that factious opposition with which the well-meant measures of the Government were resisted. He would have the hon. and learned Gentleman beware how he taught a bitter lesson to the people of England. He would implore him to bethink himself in time, and not to do irreparable injury to the cause of Irish Reform. The arguments and the tone adopted by the hon. and learned Member would go far to strike a deep and fatal blow against the cause of Irish Reform. The hon. and learned Member had said, that Irish Reform would follow English Reform, and that then the Irish people would have additional power to resist the Government and thwart their measures. He begged to remind the hon. Member that nothing could be more dangerous than to assert that passing the Reform Bill would be a mere transfer of agitation from Ireland to this House. He begged to tell the hon. Member, that he mistook the principle on which his Majesty's Government had introduced the present measure of Reform. They had not introduced that measure upon the principle of Universal Suffrage, but upon the principle of extending the franchise as widely, and amongst such persons, as might safely exercise it with advantage to themselves, and to the existing institutions of the country. That was the principle on which they proceeded to extend the franchise to as large a class of the community as they could with safety ; and if the hon. and learned Gentleman asserted that doing so would be but a transfer of agitation from Ireland to this House, he could not inflict a heavier blow on the cause of Irish Reform. The hon. and learned Gentleman, vindicating the resistance of the people, had quoted the words,

> "Hereditary bondsmen, know ye not
> Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow."

Did the hon. and learned Member pretend to be ignorant of the meaning which was attached to that language in Ireland? Did the hon. and learned Member pretend not to know for what purposes that language was employed in Ireland? It was but two days since that he (Mr. Stanley) had received from Ireland one of the most inflammatory placards that could be written. It commenced with the words which the hon. and learned Member had quoted, and the placard proceeded:—"These are the words of O'Connell; and let us follow up these words, and deal with no person, or hold intercourse with no person, who will continue to pay the unjust and oppressive exactions of tithes." This was the effect of this placard; and it was for purposes such as this that this language was used in Ireland. He thought the hon. Member should feel that he spoke in that House as a Member of the Imperial Parliament, and as the Representative of the county of Louth; and it was more befitting for a Member of that House to infuse into the people obedience to the laws, than to inflame them into a resistance to the laws. He begged to tell the hon. Gentleman that, if he felt anxious for the extension of the franchise, he could not injure what he had at heart more than by using such declarations. But he would rescue the people of Ireland from the implied imputation. He would not believe that the people of Ireland were so lost to all sense of justice; and when he should, in his place in that House, have to move the reading of the Irish Reform Bill, he should, he trusted, be able to show that the people of Ireland, despite the slanders cast on them, were in every way entitled to a share in the general advantages of Reform. The hon. member for Clare had given him credit for believing that this measure would afford relief. Now, he did not believe any such thing. He did not bring forward this measure as a measure of relief, and that which would be introduced as a measure of relief would be one in every way calculated to afford relief. He did not want that the present measure should do more than enforce the law; but did they think that it was the poor wretched peasant that would be selected for its operation? He did not wish that this law should be brought into operation against those who were poor and unable to pay, and whose arrears had accumulated from distress; but against the rich, who having the means had refused, and against the wealthy comfortable farmers, almost in the class of country gentlemen; these were the persons who would be selected; and when these persons were compelled to pay, he was sure that the resistance to the law amongst those who were influenced by their example would soon be at an end. This was not a sectarian question—this was not, as already had been well said by the hon. member for Ilchester, a question between Catholic and Protestant, but it was a question of right and property—it was a question, whether individual rights should be prostrated—whether the just claims of individuals should be set at nought, or what, perhaps, was of still more importance, whether the law should be overborne with impunity. It would, in his opinion, be contemptible in any government to allow the laws to be overborne, and its authority trampled under foot. The present measure, then, preceding as it did the measure of relief, was a measure to vindicate the law. The hon. member for Clare had that night admitted, that, if it were necessary to vindicate the law, and introduce a measure of coercion, that a more lenient measure than the present could not possibly be resorted to. The cost of these prosecutions would not fall upon the people, but upon the clergy. The object, as he said before, was, not to wage war against the poor, but to compel the rich to comply with the existing law. Great clamour had been used against this measure, but it did no more than merely transfer from the hands of the clergy, which were weak, into the hands of the Government, which were strong, the duty of asserting the rights of those individuals. It was to make the rich bow to the law—to compel those who had it in their power to pay the claims which they asserted. The hon. and learned member for Louth had talked of the consequences of Reform in Ireland; he had said that agitation would be the price of a seat in Parliament—that none but those who resisted the payment of tithes, and cheered on that resistance, could expect to be distinguished by public favour. The hon. and learned Member, with great beauty of language and happiness of quotation, had said, that there would be but a step from the Tarpeian rock to the summit of the Capitol. Now, he did think, that, if these were to be the consequences that were to result from Reform in Ireland, Reform would be an injury to that country. He begged to deny the inference of the hon. and learned Member, whose conclusions, he felt satisfied, were erroneous, and he was quite convinced that those persons who were crouching at the base of the Tarpeian rock, felt very little disposition to play the part of Marcus Curtius. He relied upon the good sense of the people of Ireland to influence them to give up the resistance to the law, when they saw that those who were setting the example of that resistance were compelled to acquiesce—when they found that, instead of having to deal with a clergy who were weak and feeble, and could not enforce their rights, that they would have to deal with a Government which was strong, and able to enforce and vindicate the laws. It was his conviction, that, as soon as the leaders of this resistance were reduced to obedience, the people, who were deluded into the following of their example, would return to their obedience also. He trusted that the Government, in the execution of this measure, would have the support of the gentry of the country, who would find that in obedience to the laws consists the best title and security of their own rights. He hoped that the predictions of those who foreboded evil from this measure would be falsified, and that the state of the country would be such as would enable them to silence the clamours of those who would resist that measure of relief which it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to afford. He would not longer occupy the time of the House. He did not intend to have trespassed on it, but for the manner in which the debate had wandered from the subject of discussion, and thanking the House for its indulgence, he would merely add, that he felt it due to his own feelings not to allow what had fallen from the hon. and learned member for Louth to pass unnoticed.

Mr. *Henry Grattan* said, that the attack of the right hon. Secretary was very ungrateful, after the zealous support which the Irish Members had invariably given to the English Reform Bill, notwithstanding the numerous rumours that had been spread abroad relative to the intended alterations in the Irish Reform Bill. It was said, the present question that had been raised upon the tithes was caused by agitation; and it was asked why their payment was not disputed before the settling of the Catholic question? He would tell the Gentlemen why. It was because the Irish people knew that till that point was carried, it was useless to agitate any other; but now that that point was gained, there were many other points that must be agitated. There was the Poor Law Question—the Absentee Question—the Jury Cess Question—and the Vestry Act Question—all of which must be agitated until they were satisfactorily settled. What the people of Ireland wanted was, not to destroy the Church Establishment, but to make a more equal distribution of its revenues. They did not like to pay men who did no duty. The right hon. Gentleman, notwithstanding his great talents, would find it difficult to carry this act into execution, whatever the hon. and learned member for Dublin might say about maintaining the rights of the Church. The very man against whom the troops were brought out was sued in the hon. and learned Gentleman's own Court, for the tithes in question, and what was stated by the party? Why, that the clergyman had no right to the tithes at all. That was what he complained of with regard to this Bill. They were putting the Attorney General into a situation of bringing actions against parties where no tithe at all was due. There was a case in which, after some vexatious proceedings, the man who was sued denied the right of the party who claimed the tithe, but said he was quite willing to pay the legal claimant. That settled the case; but then there were the costs to pay. They were giving a summary power to the Attorney General, which, for want of the necessary knowledge of the circumstances of each case, would be most oppressively and vexatiously used against the people of Ireland, who refused to pay the tithe, not contumaciously, but upon the ground, in many instances, of the want of legal right on the part of the claimant. He said to the right hon. Gentleman, "You will not succeed by this measure, but you may by the subsequent measure; if you will tell us what that is, and, if it appears to be a fair measure, all the difficulties of the case will be over. But now you have no power at all, because you must have a sale and a decree." They had heard arguments, recriminations, and speeches—and about what? About the sale of a cow. Would the Government suffer things to go on in this way—would they suffer a system to continue which required them to employ 4,000 men to sell an old cow? If they could not govern that country without a police, they had better give it up at once. To be controlled by force was what the people would not submit to longer than the Government could make them; and for this reason—if the laws were first of all bad, and you attempted to enforce them by arms, that was tyranny: and the people had a right to rise up against tyranny, whether practised by one or by many. He entreated them not to declare war against the people of Ireland, especially for the sake of maintaining the Established Church — because, though it might be established by the law, it was not established by the people: they derived no benefit from it. The Government talked of vindicating the law: this had been the dogma of Statesmen at all times—but what was the result of attempting to vindicate the law, in the case of America? They were compelled to give up the Stamp Act, and then they would vindicate the tax on tea; but they were resisted, and they finally lost the colonies. Be assured that such would ever be the result of any attempt to enforce a law which was repudiated by the whole people. He repeated the words of Mr. Burke as applied to America—if you can only govern Ireland by coercion, she is not worth governing; but adopt a conciliatory course, and Ireland will not only be easily governed, but she will be a source of strength to this country. What was the consequence of those Acts of Parliament which were passed in favour of her commerce? Was there, then, any revolution apprehended? Did not the Irish legislature vote 30,000 seamen at once, and did they not declare they would stand or fall by Great Britain—and why? Because they were governed well. But if they went on in the course they were now pursuing, Ireland would be lost; for it was idle to say that they could govern 8,000,000 of people just as they could govern a parish. The Attorney General might send one man to gaol, but what could he do with 5,000,000 of people? If the Secretary for Ireland stood upon a point of honour, the peasantry of Ireland would stand upon their point of honour; and nothing could be so foolish as to go to war with a whole people upon such an imaginary ground. There was no necessity for vindicating the law; the people had declared they would not pay the tithes for the benefit of a few, which ought to be paid, and which they were willing to pay, for the benefit of all: and it was in vain that they talked of the vindication of the law. He understood some alterations had been made in the Bill, but he had not been able to get a copy of those alterations; and yet they were now called upon to consent to the third reading. Time ought to be allowed to consider these alterations. But should the Bill be passed, he hoped it would have a peaceful issue, and not only conduce to the strength of his Majesty's Government, but to the satisfaction and stability of the country. The opposition to the Bill was not dictated by a factious hostility to the Government, but by a sincere desire to promote the general welfare. He knew men who were now sitting in that House, and had opposed this Bill, recommended the people of Ireland to pay their tithes, though, at the same time, the landlords, who were also Members of this House, had not received their rents. The Irish Members had hitherto supported his Majesty's Government; and the opposition, in this instance, was founded upon principle. He begged to assure the right hon. Gentleman, that a Government was never so secure and respectable as when it received the votes of unpaid men. If the Ministers attempted to carry on the Government in opposition to the independent Members of this House, they would most signally and most deservedly fail.

Mr. *Hume* regretted to have heard the sentiments which fell from the right hon. Secretary, because they were uncalled for by the observations of the hon. and learned member for Louth. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman what interpretation he put upon the words, which he seemed to deliver with so much emphasis—whether he thought that a Roman Catholic Member was bound, by the oath he took, never to support any alteration of the laws that regarded the property of the Church? He understood the hon. and learned member for Louth to say, that an alteration in the Church Establishment was necessary: and was an interpretation to be put upon that oath similar to that which was put upon the Coronation Oath in the late reign? He thought the speech of the right hon. Gentleman amounted very nearly to a declaration of war against Ireland. He had to-night shown the House what were the consequences of possessing power. Such doctrines as he had broached to-night might have been expected from former Administrations; but that they should come from a Member of the present did, indeed, surprise him. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean to say, that no alteration was to be made in the Church Establishment of Ireland? He understood the hon. and learned member for Louth to say, that there ought to be, and that there must be, a change, before Ireland could be quiet: and was there any man in that House, except the right hon. Gentleman himself, who would say, that the Church of Ireland was to go on without alteration? To make the Establishment congenial with the feelings of the people, an alteration to a great extent must be made. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, that it was in vain to attempt to force this measure against the feelings of the people; and that the present effort to vindicate the law, as it was called, was in exactly the same spirit in which the law was endeavoured to be vindicated in our American colonies, but which failed then, and would fail now; for, when laws were made, whether they applied to England, Scotland, or Ireland, which were inimical to the feelings of the whole people, it was impossible to carry them into effect. In the present case, Government had not redeemed their pledge to this House—they had not followed up the spirit of the Resolutions which they, by that pledge, prevailed upon the House to adopt. He, for one, concurred originally in those Resolutions, because he believed that Ministers would not propose a measure of coercion without bringing forward the remedial measure: but the House was now about to separate, and no Bill for remedying the existing evils had been brought in; so that his Majesty's Government had neither kept good faith with the country, nor had they acted in consistency with their own Resolutions. Was it possible that the right hon. Gentleman was so utterly ignorant as to fancy that such language as he had used would tend to the peace of Ireland, by prevailing on the people to acquiesce in a system which they had for ever denounced? The right hon. Gentleman said, that when the people saw, that Government could and would enforce the law, they would immediately comply with that law—but 50,000 men would not enable him to enforce the law. Was it possible that the right hon. Secretary could be uninformed of what was now passing around him? He should remember that the present Government did not stand in the same situation as the former Government. The right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues came into power upon the principle of conciliation, and they, therefore, had no moral force to sustain them in their efforts to carry a measure in opposition to the feelings of the people. Let them but pass the English Reform Bill, and then refuse the claims now made by the hon. and learned member for Louth on behalf of Ireland, if they dared. The idea was absurd. Why, the Government stood committed upon the principle of Reform, and to an equal extent to Ireland as well as to England. If, then, the Church of Ireland was not to be reformed, what kind of pledges had they from Ministers, or what were those pledges worth? He confessed he had heard with regret the whole of this debate, because it held out, as regarded Ireland, nothing but hostility and irritation. The system of rule which the speech of the right hon. Gentleman indicated, could only be maintained by an enormous military establishment. No other means could carry into effect such measures as that speech contemplated. It was a speech which they ought not to have heard; it was contrary to every thing the right hon. Gentleman stated a few nights ago. Then he condemned the system pursued towards Ireland, and told the House that it was the anxious desire of his Majesty's Government to retrace the steps of former Governments, and to conciliate, by every measure in their power, the feelings of the people of that country. Good God! could he believe that, after hearing such a speech, which was so explicit, and which gave the highest gratification to all who heard it, and which had since diffused such real satisfaction throughout Ireland—could he expect that from the same lips would proceed a speech so opposite in spirit, and so irreconcileable in principle, as the speech which had just fallen from the right hon. Gentleman? Talk of agitation—who was the agitator here? But it was in vain; the people—the millions—would not be so put down. If he could read what was passing in that country, the matter would not rest there. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that his policy of coercion had done more to unsettle Ireland than any other circumstance that had occurred for a long time past. And yet he complained of the conduct of the Irish Members. Did he expect that they were not to agitate within these walls for the sake of that country which had sent them there? If they did not, of what use were they? Were they to come here each to sit as the "silent Member?" Their duty was to agitate, and to persevere in that agitation until they had obtained a redress of those wrongs under which their country laboured. Let them be called delegates —they were such—a Representative was a delegate, and a delegate was a Representative. Was he there, for instance, to act for himself, and to hold himself irresponsible to the electors of Middlesex, and to disregard their feelings and interests, or what they were desirous to effect? If he was, then he had nothing to do with the county, but was his own Member. They were delegates to this House; but they might call them delegates or Representatives, it mattered not: it was not the name, but the duties they had to perform that concerned the people. He would repeat his regret that the Government should have persevered in this measure, instead of waiting until the other had been introduced. He feared that they would discover that they had proceeded too fast; and, by not fulfilling their pledge, they would ultimately drive the people of Ireland to desperation.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* said, he did not think the property of the Church ought to be converted to any purposes but those of the Church, and he apprehended the great majority of the people of England held the same sentiments; they might desire as he did, to see the principle of commutation generally acted upon; but the attempt to overcome the law by violence must be put down, and, therefore, he approved of the present Bill. When the remedial measure for Ireland was brought forward he should be prepared to give it his best attention.

Mr. *Lambert* opposed the Bill now as he had done from its first introduction into the House, because he thought it a weak irritating measure, and he believed would be inefficient. Indeed he was convinced that not 100*l.* would be recovered under it, unless it was accompanied by a remedial measure. This Bill proceeded on the bad principles of bad times, when the Church handed over its refractory members to the secular arm. He feared the tone and temper of the speech of the right hon. Secretary would not tend to allay the agitation in Ireland. It seemed to imply a threat that Ireland might be deprived of her part in the great measure of Parliamentary Reform.

Mr. *Stanley* begged to be allowed to interrupt the hon. Member, and to add a few words in explanation. What he said was, that the line of argument adopted by the hon. and learned member for Louth was calculated to alarm many persons in this country, and thereby impede the progress of the Irish Reform Bill; and that if he anticipated the same consequences from its passing, as was anticipated by the hon. and learned Member, he would even now withdraw it.

Mr. *Lambert* was happy to hear the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman, but he feared he could not give such a satisfactory one of the manner in which he had spoken of the oath to be taken by Catholic Members. He had taken it in its plain direct sense, and did not like to have the doctrine of double dealing thrown in his teeth. To return, however, to the Bill, the people of Ireland had decided the question; the tithe system must be abolished; but it was not yet too late for the Government by the adoption of proper measures to lead the people, and protect the interests of the Protestant clergy, by introducing measures of conciliation.

Mr. *Ralph Howard* must also join in regretting the tone and temper of the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary for Ireland. If the construction put by that right hon. Gentleman on the oath taken by Catholic Members was correct, it would have been better that the proposition of Mr. Wilmot Horton should have been carried, which prohibited them from voting upon all questions connected with the Church, than to have left them at liberty to do so. As he understood the oath he considered himself bound to abide by the existing law, but a difference of opinion might fairly exist as to the best mode of enforcing that law. He saw that on the present question a decided breach had been committed in it;

and, therefore, he had voted in support of the measure before the House, but there was a great distinction between maintaining the property of the Established Church and supporting the present unequal distribution of that property.

Mr. *Hunt* must express his abhorrence of the measure, and he must condemn the tone and the speech of the right hon. Secretary.

Sir *John Milley Doyle* said, he did not approve of the whole Bill, but, as it had proceeded so far, he would not oppose the third reading.

The House divided—Ayes 52; Noes 7—Majority 45.

Bill read a third time.

On the question that the Bill do pass,

Mr. *Sheil:* The Secretary for Ireland has assailed me. I could not reply to him, according to the rules of the House, until the motion that this Bill do now pass. I rise to answer him, but without resentment; for I make allowance for his feelings with respect to the Church. It is not that his early reputation is associated with it by his debut—there is something more substantial than mere oratory to bind him to it. He is chained to the Church by a golden link, which it would be preposterous to require of him to break. The magnanimity which is requisite to sacrifice his interests is not to be expected from such specimens of the hon. Gentlemen's feelings, habits and character, as have been witnessed in this House. Yet I do not accuse him of any impurity of motive. It is just possible that his judgment may be obscured, and that he may find it difficult to arrive at a sound conclusion, when there are so many impediments to unbiassed reasoning in his way. Then why should I resent his giving me a lesson? Why should I complain of his taunts, and his harshness, and his rebuffs, and his lack of common courtesy, when he uses Ireland in the same fashion? Can I hope to escape from the fate which is destined for my country? Yet the hon. Gentleman may be ultimately treated by his 7,000,000 of pupils after the manner in which the Roman schoolmaster was used for having betrayed his country to Camillus. The hon. Gentleman says, I have given, by my menaces, a blow to the Irish Reform Bill. He is himself the man who has forced these topics into discussion, and by rashly and obstinately pressing his measures forward, pending the Reform question, has exasperated Ireland, and those by whom Ireland is represented. The right hon. Gentleman has arrayed an entire nation against him, by his demeanour and his proceedings, and he then complains of indiscretion. Now what has been the hon. Gentleman's conduct? What has he done? To what act of wisdom can he refer as evidence of his genius for legislation? He commenced with the Arms Bill, and according to the rules of political unity, faithful to his character, he was about to make his exit from Ireland with the Tithe Bill—a bill in every way worthy of him—a bill of a precipitate, rash, domineering kind, on which the right hon. Gentleman has stamped an image of himself, and impressed it with the proofs of his parliamentary parentage. What has been his conduct this very night? Although so many of the men who are associated with him in office are pledged to reduce the wealth of the Irish Church, yet he stands up in the front of the Government, and declares that no change in the establishment shall be made. But there is a spirit abroad — the spirit which carried emancipation for one country, and is carrying Reform for both—which will strike down the pile of consecrated abuse, and, instead of being able to uphold that mass of sacred enormities which already totters beneath the shocks of public opinion, he will fall beneath, and be crushed under its ruins.

Mr. *Stanley:* In the course of the observations which have fallen from the hon. Gentleman, he stated that he was not influenced in the attacks which he has thought proper to make upon me by any feeling of irritation or vindictiveness, but I put it to the House whether the speech of the hon. Gentleman indicated that total abstinence from personal feeling for which he appeared to claim so much credit. The hon. and learned Gentleman appears to be in full possession of the secrets of the Cabinet, and professes to know what is passing in the councils of the Government, although he must be aware that the Members of the Cabinet are sworn not to divulge what passes at their meetings. The hon. Gentleman stated, that I brought forward the Arms' Bill, without consulting my colleagues in the Government. I will tell the hon. Gentleman, and I speak in the presence of some of those who are my associates in office, that I did submit that bill to the other Members of the Government. It was not, however, at the time completed, and on consideration, a difference of opinion, I admit, did prevail respecting some of the clauses, which were conceived too strong, and although I was convinced of the propriety of that measure, and have since heard no reason which would justify me in changing that opinion. I have, however, abandoned the measure, not because I was convinced of its impolicy, but on account of the dissatisfaction expressed against it by the Irish Members. The hon. Gentleman has, therefore, no right to taunt me with having, upon that occasion, surrendered my own judgment and deferred to the opinion of the Irish Members, contrary to the convictions of my own mind. The hon. and learned Gentleman has thought proper to insinuate that I have been actuated by other than constitutional motives in bringing forward this measure. [The hon. and learned member for Louth shook his head, in token of dissent.] The hon. Gentleman may shake his head, but will he deny that he used the words? In the course of his former speech the hon. and learned Member made obervations which I took down at the moment, yet notwithstanding that the hon. and learned Member afterwards disclaimed them.

Mr. *Sheil* begged to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, for the purpose of explanation. He did not throw any imputation upon his motives; but he did say, that there were certain ties, a golden link, which bound him to the Church, and which might possibly have the effect of prejudicing his mind and obscuring his vision against the abuse of the establishment.

Mr. *Stanley:* "I make the hon. and learned Member a present of his explanation. I will pass by this topic—it is unworthy of notice." The hon. Gentleman (continued Mr. Stanley) sought to be informed what the present Government had done for Ireland. Why, he appeared to think that men who came into office after years of exclusion, should be at once prepared with antidotes against all the evils which a system pursued by former Governments had engrafted in the Constitution of that country—that all their plans of improvement should be prepared and matured at once—that what would require years to complete, should be executed in a single day, and Ireland should spring up a new country simultaneously with the change of Administration. Did not the hon. Gentleman know that before he set his foot in Ireland, he had been made the object of the most foul and slanderous attack; that every effort that could possibly be devised had been resorted to to counteract every attempt of his to better the condition of that country? He would certainly acquit the hon. Gentleman of any participation in these acts; he must do him the justice to say, that he never abused him behind his back, or gave utterance to an expression which he would not use to his face—he never joined that faction which heaped vilification upon Government, because they would not go the lengths which those demagogues demanded. But was it true that the present Government had done nothing for Ireland? Had they not carried through that House a Bill for the Regulation of Juries? Would the hon. and learned Gentleman say, that that measure was of no benefit to Ireland? Had the Ministers not, in despite of a violent opposition from a most powerful party, established a national system of education? Was that doing nothing? and had they not, within the last few days, pledged both Houses of Parliament to the abolition of tithes? Would that have been done if the present Government had not come into office? Would Ireland have had her Jury Bill, her Board of Education? would tithes ever be extinguished if a Tory Administration were in power? and yet they were to be told that they had done nothing for Ireland. The hon. Gentleman had taunted him with his Arms Bill. He had attributed to him a disposition to coerce the people. Did not the hon. Gentleman know that applications had been made by Magistrates in certain counties in Ireland, for an increase of power, for an augmentation of the military force? did he not know, that in some instances the Insurrection Act had been demanded, and yet Government refused these applications, and relied on the ordinary power of the law to restore subordination? Did this look like a disposition on his part to coerce the people? But this very night had not attacks been made upon them in another place, for not granting powers to put down the people. So much for the attack of the hon. Gentleman. In the remarks which he had made, and which appeared to have given so much offence to the hon. Gentleman, he did not intend anything disrespectful towards him or any other hon. Member for Ireland, who acted in connexion with him upon this occasion. He came there to support the measure before the House, and if the hon. and learned Gentleman thought proper to introduce a topic foreign from that question —if he undertook to discuss the meaning of the oath taken by Roman Catholics upon entering that House, he felt that he was but discharging his duty, in replying to the observations of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and expressing in the strongest terms, his reprobation of the doctrines which he had heard that night with astonishment, put forward by the hon. and learned Gentleman. Much had been said about the support which Government had received from the Irish Members. He was not disposed to undervalue that support; but he must say that the general support which they gave to the Government, by no means precluded him from expressing his dissent from them on any public question upon which he might entertain a different opinion. This was a principle upon which he would always act, and he begged of hon. Members not to deceive themselves by supposing that he could be induced to abandon a course which he conscientiously believed to be correct.

Bill passed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, *April* 17, 1832.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of the Earl of HAREWOOD, Copies of all Reports from the Bishop of Jamaica, and of all other Information received by Government, showing the means furnished by that Colony for the Religious Instruction of the Slave and Coloured Population, with the Number of Churches, Chapels, and other Places of Worship, and of the Clergy attached thereto; similar Returns from the Bishop of Barbadoes; an Account of the Civil, Ecclesiastical, and Military Establishments of Jamaica, the Expenses of which are defrayed by the Colony, the Annual Amount of such Expenses, with the manner in which the Revenue is raised and appropriated; similar Accounts from all the other West-India Colonies; Copies of all Laws passed by the several Colonial Legislatures for the renewal of Disabilities of the Free Persons of Colour, passed during the last six years, and for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Slave Population, since the year 1823; Copies of a Patent of Land in Jamaica granted to Persons in 1690, and 1745, and an Account of all Manumissions granted between 1817, and 1830, distinguishing the Numbers in each year, and those which were Gratuitous, and those paid for; and similar Returns from the other West-India Islands.

Petitions presented. By the Earl of ROSSLYN, from the Presbytery of St. Andrew's and Fife. By the Bishop of LONDON, from Annan. By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from Forfar. By the Earl of RODEN, from Ashbourne. By Viscount LORTON, from Parishes in Dublin. By the Duke of WELLINGTON, from the Synod of Glasgow and Air; and by the Duke of NEWCASTLE, from the Minister and Congregation of St. James's Church near Nottingham, Inhabitants of Cotgrave, Hickling, and Over Broughton, against the New System of Education for Ireland:—By the Marquis of WESTMEATH, from the Roman Catholics of Galway, complaining of an Interpolation in their Indemnity Bill:—By the Earl of HAREWOOD, from Port Glasgow, for Protection for the West-India Colonies:—By the Earl of GOSFORD, from the Belfast Reform Society, and from the Predditch and Hadley Political Unions, in favour of the Reform Bill:—By the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, from Persons employed in Cotton Mills in Outwood, Alkington, and Kersley, in favour of the Factory Bill:—By the Duke of WELLINGTON, from the Merchants, Manufacturers, and Inhabitants of Glasgow; and by the Duke of BUCCLEUGH, from the Trades House of Glasgow for further Protection to the Produce of the West-India Colonies.

WEST-INDIA INTEREST.] The Earl of *Harewood* said, he had the honour to present to their Lordships a Petition from a Meeting of the Noblemen, Merchants, and Gentlemen, connected with West-India Affairs, praying that the subject of the West-India Interests might be referred for consideration to a Committee of that House. He had attended the meeting, and he could take upon himself to assert, that a more numerous or more respectable meeting of West-India Proprietors, and others connected with colonial affairs, had never before been assembled, even in the city of London, and that there never was a meeting of which the individuals composing it felt more intensely how much their interests were involved in the results and fate of their petition. In presenting this petition, and in making the few observations which he felt himself called upon to make on the occasion, he entirely disclaimed all political views; and, although the subject might lead him to make some remarks on the proceedings of Government in regard to the West-India interests, he assured their Lordships that he would strictly confine himself to such remarks as might be absolutely necessary for the elucidation of the subject. In the first place, the petition complained of the state of distress in which the West-India colonies and the West-India interests in general were at present involved. It was needless for him to take up the time of their Lordships in proving that such a state of distress existed. That was admitted by all who had the least acquaintance with colonial affairs. It was admitted even by his Majesty's Ministers themselves, for they had taken some steps towards the application of a remedy. But when it was considered how these distresses had originated—that they were not owing to accidental causes, but to a system—it could scarcely be denied that it was a proper matter for consideration whether the system might not be advantageously altered. One thing was clear, that the state of distress was such that West-India property might be considered as almost confiscated, and the property of the colonial proprietors almost annihilated, the produce remitted to the mother country not paying anything like the expense of producing it. Such was the existing condition of the West-India interests; and the prayer of the petitioners was, that their Lordships would appoint a Committee of their own body to investigate the subject, to ascertain the extent of the distress, and to inquire into the causes which led to it, and to decide what was the proper remedy to be applied. It was not his intention to enter at present upon a discussion of the effect of the duties imposed on West-India produce, or of the other causes which might have contributed to the depression of the West-India interest. It was unnecessary for him to do so, since he understood that his Majesty's Ministers intended to accede to the prayer of the petitioners, and to grant the Committee. But he might say, that if the system which had for some time been acted upon, in regard to the West Indies, was persevered in, the colonies must indubitably sink. It would be impossible to save them from destruction. He would, at present, for the same reason, abstain from entering upon any discussion as to the effect of the free-trade system on the West-India colonies, as that subject also would better come under consideration in the Committee. But, he repeated, that when he considered that the present unparalleled distress of the West-India interests did not arise from accidental causes, but from a regular system which had been for some time in operation, it was well worthy of inquiry whether that system ought not to be altered. It was highly expedient that their Lordships should investigate and endeavour to ascertain whether a perseverance in the system must not be inevitably attended with the destruction of the colonies: and if they should be of opinion that it would, then it would be for their Lordships to consider which was the better course—to change their policy, or to lose the colonies. He was perfectly aware that any man who in these times stood up as an advocate of the West-India interests would be viewed in a most odious light by one party in the country. He was perfectly sensible of the prejudices which prevailed among a certain portion of the people of this country on the subject; but, notwithstanding the prejudices which prevailed, he would not shrink from appearing openly as the advocate of the much-depressed West-India interests; and he was convinced that when these interests were better and more generally understood, the prejudices would be very considerably diminished. A notion appeared to be generally prevalent that the West-India proprietors preferred, from some unworthy and selfish motives, to have the labour of the colonies performed by slaves rather than by freemen, and that they might dismiss their slaves and get the work performed by freemen without any real detriment to their own interests, or injury to their property. That, however, was very far from being the case. It was not considered as it ought to be, that if the West-India proprietor, connected with a house in this country, could not carry on the concerns of his estate, except at a loss, he must consequently cease to cultivate, and yet he was still bound to maintain the slaves. The slaves must still be supported, and what followed? It necessarily followed that the value of his own estate was exceedingly depreciated, and that the depreciation extended, in a greater or less degree, to other estates. It was, therefore, the duty of their Lordships to apply themselves seriously to the consideration of the causes of the existing distress of the West-India interest, and to ascertain whether anything could be done in the way of remedy. He was one of those who possessed property in the West-India colonies; and, speaking for himself as well as for other West-India proprietors, he could take upon himself positively to say, that if the labour of the colonies could be carried on in any other way than by means of the slaves, they would be all ready to adopt that other method. But the labour of the colonies could not be carried on with advantage in any other way than by means of the slaves, and if they were to put an end to slave labour, the necessary consequence would be, the loss of the colonies altogether. But when the state of the West Indies came to be better understood in this country, there was good reason to expect that much of the prejudice that existed in regard to those colonies would be exploded. Considering the situation in which the West-India interests at present stood, he would seriously ask, whether this was a proper time to irritate the slaves, and excite discontent and agitation among them by frequent motions in Parliament, having reference to their condition? Yet such motions were frequently made, and if the practice should be continued, the consequences, in all probability, would be fatal. There was another topic connected with the petition as to which he must say a few words. He alluded to what were called the Orders in Council issued in regard to the West Indies; these Orders in Council had been attended with much mischief to the colonies. At those times, when Parliaments were dissolved, and new elections took place, there had been for some time a disposition in the Government to do something to conciliate electors through the medium of Orders in Council, and more particularly Orders in Council relative to the West-India colonies, and the state of the slaves. These Orders had been made without that consideration which the subject deserved, and imperiously demanded. Ministers ought to consider well before they framed and promulgated Orders in Council, the tendency of which was to take the slaves from under the authority of their masters; and it was impossible that such a state of society could be established to any extent without being fatal to the best interests of any country where it was introduced. Then, with regard to the Orders in Council recently promulgated, if he had not known how the matter really stood, and had to collect his information from these Orders, he should have certainly thought that nothing had ever before been done in regard to the same subject. He should have thought that this was the beginning of a system of regulation for the colonies, and that now something was, for the first time, to be done to rescue the slaves from a state of tyrannical oppression and starvation. The Orders in Council had, in fact, descended to such minutiæ, as to regulate the quantities and species of provisions to be supplied to the slaves. All this served to augment the prejudices that prevailed against the West-India proprietors, as they seemed to bear on the face of them that the state of the slaves had been utterly neglected; and had now, for the first time, attracted the attention of the Government. He need not inform their Lordships that nothing could be more erroneous than such a notion. Before issuing these Orders in Council, it would have been well to have considered whether the matters to be remedied were such as to call for Orders in Council to effect the object; and whether Orders in Council were the best mode of applying a remedy, if remedy were wanted. It was not his wish to speak harshly of any party. But he would say, that the West-India colonies were of the greatest value to this country; and that it was very far from creditable to any party to resort to, and act upon, a systematic plan, of writing down the West-India interest. Let the state of these colonies be coolly and dispassionately examined and considered, and then let the measures be adopted in regard to them that might appear best calculated to promote the permanent interests of these colonies, and of the country in general; but he maintained that it was discreditable to have matters of such importance rendered mere bones of contention between struggling parties. A calm and dispassionate examination of the system would be the best way to dispel the prejudices which prevailed among a large party in this country, with respect to the state of the colonies. It would be considered in the Committee whether anything was now requisite to be done in regard to the slaves, and in the Report their Lordships would state what was most proper to be done for their benefit, without destruction to the property of the master. But he assured their Lordships that considerable delicacy was required in framing regulations with regard to the management of the slaves, and he had strong objections to Orders in Council, as the medium through which such regulations were to be promulgated. The recent Orders in Council applied equally to all the islands, however various in soil and climate. The same regulations as to the particular hours of labour were applied, for instance, to Demerara and Barbadoes, although what would answer well for the one would be extremely prejudicial to the other. The same hour for the commencement of labour had been appointed for both. The time was very inconvenient in Demerara, but in Barbadoes the slaves would most willingly go to labour at an earlier hour, so as to finish their work soon, and have the rest of the day to themselves. The Orders were very inapplicable to the state of some of the colonies in respect of the limitation of the hours of labour. Their inapplicability was also remarkable in regard to sugar labour. He did not wish to say anything calculated to excite irritation in the minds of any individuals, or any party, but there was one part of the Orders in Council which he could not allow to pass without particular notice. The Order said to the legislators of the West-India Legislative colonies, "You shall make this Order a law of your state, otherwise we will not give you certain advantages which you shall have if you comply. You shall have the benefits if you agree; but if you do not adopt the Order, then you shall not have the benefits, whatever they may be." Suppose they say, "the Order is utterly inapplicable to the state of the colonies, and we cannot adopt it." Then the Government said, "You shall not have the benefits;" and if the deprivation of the benefits should be of a nature utterly to ruin the estates of the colonists, was the resolution of the Government to be preferred to the utter destruction of the colonists, and the total abandonment of the West-India islands? Ministers ought to carry on the government of these colonies in the best mode that could be adopted, consistently with the best interests of the colonies, and, consequently, of the whole country. He need state no more at present as to the nature and object of this petition. The petitioners had, before the manufacture—as he might call it—of these Orders in Council, been anxious to have a Committee of this kind appointed, that the matters to which they referred might be thoroughly considered. This, however, they could not obtain. They had then endeavoured to have the Orders in Council referred to a Committee before they were carried into effect, but the Government would not agree to this proposal. The Orders were, therefore, sent out and promulgated without any such previous consideration, and had, to a certain extent, been carried into execution in the Crown Colonies; but the execution had been suspended in the Legislative Colonies, on the ground that it was not fitting that they should be made a law of these states. The petitioners only asked now what they had asked before; and as the Committee was to be granted, it was not necessary to dwell at any greater length at present on the subject. It was just, however, that this subject should be thoroughly investigated in Committee; and he suggested that the execution of the Orders in Council should be suspended, until the Committee should have considered the matter, and made its Report to the House. He would conclude by presenting the petition, and moving that it be read, giving notice, at the same time, that it was his intention to follow this up by moving that the petition be referred to a Committee.

The petition read.

Lord *Suffield* declared that he had no idea of addressing the House until he heard the speech of the noble Earl in presenting this petition; but after having listened to the document itself, and the arguments with which the noble Earl supported it, he could not help saying that, in his opinion, it would be a most extraordinary proceeding if his Majesty's Government agreed to the appointment of the Committee required. Was it to be supposed that their Lordships' House was the only body of persons in the country unacquainted with the state of the West-India Islands? or was that House to appoint a Committee to consider a question the evils of which were known to almost every man in the community, and admitted from one end of the kingdom to the other? There needed no Committee to inform them of the distressed situation of the colonies. The mere fact of the existence of slavery was sufficient to account for it. The power of man over human life was ever accompanied by the infliction of moral and bodily cruelty. The noble Earl complained of the distresses of the West-India colonies, but surely it required no penetration to discover the cause; and when it was stated, that the diminution of the population kept exactly pace with the state of labour and of property in each colony, the House would see that the system of slavery was the main and principal source of their decline. He did not wish to say much concerning the better policy on this subject adopted by the present Administration, lest he should appear to convey a censure on the conduct of their predecessors, which at present he had no desire to do. But he thanked God that the proper policy in regard to the West-India colonies was now better understood. The state of the West-India colonies was perfectly well known to almost all the people of this country, and was it to be supposed that their Lordships alone were ignorant of it, and that it was necessary for them to appoint a Committee to supply them with the proper information? That such a Committee should have been conceded by the Government, did, he confessed, appear to him most extraordinary. As to the Orders in Council, he did most sincerely thank the Government for having made that attempt to ameliorate the condition of the slaves, and ultimately to annihilate the state of slavery. The colonial Legislatures had for a length of time defeated all attempts of this description, but he hoped that we had now a Government sincerely disposed to ameliorate the condition of the slaves, and to extinguish totally the evils of slavery, and he trusted that they would not much longer suffer their attempts to be defeated. The Government had, in his opinion, hit on the secret for ameliorating the condition of the slave, by entitling such colonies as adopted their recommendations to certain advantages. The measures they were about to introduce seemed to him to be the best calculated of all others to effect that object. The only way to deal with the refractory colonists was to attack them through their interests, and as they had thought proper to reject all the recommendations of the Government for the improvement of the condition of their slaves, they must now bear the consequence. As to the decaying state of their trade and resources, it should be recollected that the profits of the colonial trade were always uncertain; and, he believed, notwithstanding all the advocates of the West-Indians might say in that House or elsewhere, that all the assistance which could be given them would be unavailing, and that it was impossible to save them from destruction. Once more he thanked God that this matter had turned out as it had done, and that in every quarter of the kingdom the case was now well understood. It was, therefore, with no little surprise that he heard the speech of the noble Earl, and the prayer for inquiry with which the petition he presented was made to conclude. What was the real nature of the case? Free labour was found more productive than that drawn from the slaves. Look at the East Indies. Sugar was cultivated there by free labour, and could be brought to this country and sold in competition with West-India sugar, notwithstanding the greater cost of the carriage from the greater distance between the two countries. It must be presumed that this sugar brought a remunerating price, or the merchant would not carry on the trade. Free labour was, therefore, the more profitable; and if the West-Indians expected a redress of grievances they must assist the Legislature in removing the evils of slavery, and avail themselves of the benefit of free labour in the colonies.

The Earl of *Harewood* must take leave to say, in explanation, that the noble Lord had wasted many words in combating propositions which he (Lord Harewood) had not advanced. He had never objected to the principle of the Orders in Council, nor had the petitioners, whose cause he advocated, entertained any idea of that kind. They objected to parts of these Orders as being vexatious and unnecessary, but he had never heard, and, he believed, on inquiry, it would never be proved, that the colonists had resisted any plans for the safe and perfect amelioration of the condition of the slaves. The question was, to what extent it should be carried at once?

Viscount *Goderich* said, that after the speech of the noble Earl (Harewood), who had abstained from entering much into the details of this most important question, he did not think it would be incumbent on him to trouble their Lordships at much length, or to make them more than a very few observations on the general question. He must, however, in justice to the station he held in the Government, make some remarks on two points—first, with regard to the Orders in Council, of which their Lordships had heard so much, and next, with respect to the Motion with which the noble Earl meant to follow up the presentation of his petition. He had always considered the situation of the Government with respect to the West-India question to be one of peculiar delicacy and difficulty, in consequence on the one hand of the great interest excited by two subjects which particularly engaged the attention of the people of this country—one connected with the actual condition of the slaves themselves, and the other a still more delicate and intricate one, having reference to their ultimate condition, and the time when it might be considered expedient to invest them with the privileges of freemen. On the other hand, it could not be doubted that, with a strong public feeling pressing on the Government in this country, there was a very considerable irritation in the minds of the colonists at what they thought the unjust charges brought against them, and, as a consequence, a very strong disinclination to receive or to adopt that system of laws and regulations which they deemed inconsistent with their rights, and a manifest invasion of their property. For the last eight years, he believed, it had been the undeviating policy of the Government to endeavour to steer an even course between the two extremes—the party of the abolitionists on the one hand, and of the colonists on the other: and, he would undertake to prove that the whole of the measures adopted during that period, including the more recent ones of the Orders in Council, had the same objects in view,—namely, to modify the extreme zeal of parties in this country, and to induce the colonists to adopt these modifications in the condition of the slave which prudence and humanity required. It was with those views, and in obedience to that principle that the House of Commons adopted the Resolutions of 1823. Those Resolutions were expressly intended to further the modification of the laws respecting the slaves, and ultimately, at some period, to abolish slavery itself—a distant object, undoubtedly, if they pleased to say so, and an object difficult of attainment, but that was the object of the Resolutions, and the understanding of all who agreed to them. The first attempts of the Government to carry these Resolutions into effect were not successful, nor did they answer the just expectations of Parliament and the country. It was with a hope of making a deeper impression on the minds of the colonists that their Lordships were afterwards called on to agree to Resolutions similar to those which had passed the Commons. He did not wish to say any thing which might call forth unpleasant feelings. He was anxious to guard himself against the use of any expression which might bear the interpretation of warmth or be construed into hostility; but this he must say, in good truth, that the course of legislation pursued by the colonists, in compliance with the recommendations contained in the Resolutions agreed to by both Houses of Parliament, had been anything but commensurate with the just expectations of Parliament or the Government. The course, unfortunately pursued by the colonists, rendered it necessary that some steps should be taken by the Executive Government, in obedience to the declared will of Parliament, and, although the noble Earl objected to forcing regulations on the legislative colonies, he could not object to the course which the Government had it in its power to adopt towards those which were called the Crown colonies. In the year 1830 the Government sent out an Order in Council to the Crown colonies, embodying a great variety of regulations, some of them new and some of them old, but all of great importance to the condition and well-being of the slave; and in the despatch which accompanied those orders, it was expressly stated that there were many other matters of the greatest importance connected with the hours of labour, and the quantity of food, clothing, and so forth, which were not embodied in the order, but which would have been so embodied if it had been the intention of the Government to produce a complete Code of Laws for the regulation of the colonies. It was clear, therefore, that the Government of that time had merely abstained from introducing such regulations, not because they believed they had not the power, but because, as the despatch expressed it, they had no intention to do any thing of the kind at that time. It was equally clear, however, that the measure of 1830 was not intended to be a final measure, and the present Ministers had to consider the question whether the Government were to stand still or go on. In obedience to the pledge contained in the Resolutions, Ministers had felt it their duty to follow up these Orders of 1830 by the Orders which were now the subject of consideration, and to many of which the noble Earl had observed there were such serious objections. It was, he believed, admitted, that it would be quite impossible to frame any orders which would not be the subject of much criticism on particular points. The noble Earl contended that many of the regulations, with respect to clothing and food, were absolutely absurd, and that they were particularly objectionable in other respects, because they seemed to cast an imputation on the humanity of the masters, and to legislate as if there was a feeling that the planters were wanting in good will to support and provide for the comforts of the slave. Now, it did so happen, that if the Orders in Council were objectionable in this respect, and on account of their minuteness, that was no fault of his (Lord Goderich's), nor could any blame attach to him for the introduction of these regulations. He had not the merit of inventing them; for it so happened that they were taken from that code of regulations which already prevailed in one of the colonies (Demerara); and all that had been done was, to consolidate, under one head, all that had been for some time in practice. The noble Earl seemed, however, to think that there was something degrading to the character of the master in some of these regulations. No one, he apprehended, could deny that it was the nature of power, when uncontrolled, to be abused. This was as true of bodies as of individuals; and, he conceived it to be no reflection, either on the bodies or on individuals, that the Legislature, feeling the necessity of guarding against the exercise of this uncontrolled power, had taken care that those who possessed such an influence over almost the life, certainly over the comforts and happiness, of the slave, should not be able to abuse it. This rule, applying to all, for the present Ministers to have acted on it, could not, he conceived, be a just matter of complaint. But the plain fact was, that the principle of the Orders was taken from a Bill which had been introduced in one of the colonies by the colonists themselves, for the regulation of the food, clothing, and hours of labour of the slaves. This was done by their own will, and not at the instigation of the Government; and, he referred to it for the purpose of showing the principle on which the Government proceeded in those orders which were the subject of complaint. In the Bahamas, in the year 1824, a Bill was introduced, of which the preamble ran thus:—"Whereas it is due to good policy, as well as to justice and the fulfilment of the principles of humanity, that all means should be taken for improving the condition of the slaves, and affording them an adequate quantity of necessaries and clothing, as well as a sufficient supply of sound and wholesome food; and whereas it seems to us highly expedient that they should not be left to individual humanity; but, on the contrary, should be regulated by law, &c." And then the Bill went on to show how this was to be effected. He would not enter further into the nature of the regulations: but, he thought, he had stated enough to show that there was nothing new in the principle adopted in them, nothing with which the colonists could fairly find fault as being of the invention of the Government. Whatever objections might be taken to particular points, or however the colonists might be disposed to question this or that regulation, he could not then go into a defence of the course pursued by the Government without accompanying it by statements which would have anything but the effect of calming the public mind, or leading to that impartial decision which was, under all considerations, so desirable. Referring to the proposition of the noble Earl, that the adoption of the Orders in Council should be preceded by an inquiry into their necessity, his (Lord Goderich's) answer would be that it was not at all necessary to show there had been no particular acts of cruelty committed in order to justify the course adopted by the Government. The object of the regulation was to take away the possession of that absolute power over the existence and happiness of the slave which human nature was liable to abuse, and it was not necessary to postpone the fulfilment of these regulations until they ascertained, by examination of evidence, whether there was more or less of justice in certain charges of cruelty brought against the planters as a body. Under this view of the case, he now came to explain why it was, that he was not disposed to urge any objections to the proposition of the noble Earl for a Select Committee. The state of the West-India colonies was, unfortunately, quite as distressing as the noble Earl had represented it to be on presenting the petition. There was, under the present circumstances of the planters, a general decay of trade and insecurity of property which could not be contemplated without pain. Estates were loaded with debts which there was scarcely any probability of the proprietor being able to discharge, and this situation of an interest so important as that of the West Indies was likely to affect, and in truth had affected, most seriously the various other interests in the country, which were closely dependent on it. Into this it was most important that the House should inquire; and, undoubtedly, it was natural for the planters, who believed they were suffering under erroneous imputations, and that, individually and collectively, their characters lay under aspersions which they knew to be unjust, undoubtedly it was natural that they, in the course of such an inquiry, should be anxious to prove that the charges made against them were wholly unfounded. Whether, however, it was a judicious course in the West-India planters to enter on such an inquiry at the present moment was quite another question. He, for his part, questioned much the prudence and the policy of the inquiry; because he was satisfied, if they entered on it, the inquiry might have the effect of increasing rather than assuaging or moderating the excitement which prevailed; and he, too, was by no means clear as to its result. He had felt this, and stated it when the application was first made to him; and he had attempted to dissuade the West Indians from seeking the inquiry, but he had failed. Feeling, therefore, the prevailing sentiment in their Lordships' House, and among a very numerous and influential class out of doors, to be in favour of inquiry, he had felt it his duty to abandon his own preconceived opinion, and to offer no objection to the Motion of the noble Earl for a Committee. Continuing the policy pursued by the Government, he should, if a Member of that Committee, use his best endeavours to preserve an intermediate course, and seek to conduct the investigation so as to arrive at the truth; for of this he was certain, that nothing could prove more unfortunate for the West Indians than the making any attempt to shut out that evidence which bore on the humanity and justice of the case, and in the support of which so large a portion of the community were deeply interested. One good, he would fain hope, must result from the inquiry—namely, that the colonial legislatures would see the necessity of resorting, without further delay, to those local regulations for the amelioration of the condition of the slaves which were required of them, and without consenting to which they must see their property would be subjected to those sudden gusts which disorganised the whole state of society, and shook their interests to their foundation.

Lord *Seaford* observed that he always addressed their Lordships with great reluctance, but he could not avoid, in the present melancholy state of distress in which the West Indians were plunged by the measures of the Government, making one or two remarks on the arguments of the noble Viscount, the Secretary for the colonies. The noble Viscount in speaking of the Orders in Council, and the necessity of their being adopted by the colonies possessing local legislatures, had declared that they were in conformity with the principle of the Resolutions of 1823; and as he had stated in the despatch which was sent out with them, that the Orders were rendered necessary by the concurrence of the legislature in their propriety at the time the Resolutions were agreed to. If the noble Viscount meant to say that Parliament pledged itself at that time to any course at all resembling that which had been pursued by the present Government, he (Lord Seaford), as one of those who gave his full concurrence to those Resolutions, begged most distinctly to deny that he had any knowledge of such a pledge. In all that was contained in the Resolutions of 1823, as proposed by Mr. Canning, he (Lord Seaford) fully and entirely concurred. To all and every measure calculated for the improvement of the moral and social condition of the slave—for the protection and enlargement of his civil rights, and for defining the period at which slavery was to cease altogether — as far as that period could be defined in consistence with the well-being of the slave himself, and the fair and equitable adjustment of the rights of private property—to all measures of that description, or for that end, he had given his support; but to the Orders in Council, as promulgated by the present Government, he had not and could not give his support, nor had he at any time considered himself pledged to support such orders because he had voted for the Resolutions of 1823. He had not pledged himself to the Orders, because no measure of such a character—connected as it was with a threat of fiscal punishments in the event of a refusal—was in the contemplation of the Members of Parliament who concurred in the Resolutions, and none such were alluded to, or within the contemplation of Mr. Canning when he proposed them. It would require more time than he could venture to exact from their Lordships to go into the whole of the documents through which this view of the question could be supported. He would merely refer to the course pursued by Mr. Canning himself, who, in speaking of the application of the Orders to the Island of Trinidad, declared it was an experiment; or, as he afterwards said, an example, by which he looked, at no distant period, to obtain the co-operation and concurrence of the islands which possessed legislative assemblies. And he added, "I cannot believe that much time will elapse before we shall learn that the planter of Jamaica is anxiously employed in emulating the endeavours of the Government in Trinidad to improve the condition of his negroes." Now, what had been the course pursued by the noble Viscount, who boasted that he was treading in the steps of Mr. Canning, and in fulfilment of the Resolutions of 1823? Did he wait for the operation of the experiment he was trying in St. Lucia or Trinidad, before he insisted on its adoption by the planter of Jamaica? Did he take time to allow the salutary influence of the Orders to be evident in the Crown colonies before he required their adoption by the old colonies? No. He sends out the Orders, accompanied with a despatch, in which he requires that, without loss of time, they should have all the force of law. Instead of waiting to see the effect of example or experiment, he threatens them at once with coercion; for what other name could be applied to their exclusion from that boon which a Committee of the House of Commons had thought justly due to the sufferings of the colonists, and their claims on the Legislature. He would ask, therefore, was the noble Viscount justified in saying that he acted in conformity with the Resolutions of 1823? Mr. Canning threatened to adopt measures of severity; but it was in a case which he hoped never to see realised, and which had not been realised. The noble Viscount threatened now, but under what different circumstances. He (Lord Seaford) did not mean to stand up as the indiscriminate defender of all that was said and done in the colonial assemblies, or of the manner in which they had at various times received the propositions of the Government; but if the members of the assemblies had occasionally exhibited heat and a want of command of temper there had been no want of exhibitions of the same qualities on the part of their adversaries. It had been at all times acknowledged by all Governments, that with a view to the advantages of ultimate and complete emancipation, nothing should be done which would destroy the good understanding between the planter and the slaves, and that no means were to be adopted which could in any way endanger the tranquillity of the colonies or affect the security of property. The Orders in Council, however, were calculated to produce the very reverse of all that. They had put an end to all confidence—they had, in their consequences, effaced all feelings of security; and this was one of the main causes of the resistance offered to their acceptance. It had been said, that the planters did nothing towards forwarding the wishes of the Government and the people of this country; that they adopted no steps towards the amelioration of the condition of the slave. Was it necessary to remind the noble Viscount of the progress which had been made on that point, without which all others would be unavailing—the thorough religious instruction of the negro? Was it necessary to remind him that the Bishops of Barbadoes and Jamaica had both, in their reports to the Government at home, expressed themselves perfectly satisfied with what had been done by the planters and the colonial legislatures with reference to that all-important question? Was it necessary to refer to the churches and chapels that had been everywhere raised for the use of the negro throughout the colonies? In further confirmation of this—if confirmation it wanted—he could appeal to the most reverend Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury), the President of the Society for affording Religious Instruction to the Negro, whether the communications of the missionaries, and all the correspondence of the society, did not show that on this point the instruction of the slave met with no obstacles. He (Lord Seaford) admitted that the Orders in Council enforced many just and humane regulations, but was it not fair to acknowledge that the colonists had not been slow in the work of liberality and justice? Why, had the House not heard of that Act, passed spontaneously by the assembly of Jamaica, which at once got rid of all disqualifications on account of colour by abolishing the necessity of taking oaths and that, too, in a country where the prejudices of colour and of caste necessarily prevailed more strongly than in any other where slavery existed? Mr. Canning, in one of his eloquent appeals on this subject, had reminded the House of Commons how much the difficulties of the question of Negro Emancipation were aggravated by purely physical distinctions;

distinctions greater than those which prevailed in any other country on the face of the globe; and yet the colonists, who were now unjustly charged with a want of liberality and good feeling had triumphed over these distinctions, and admitted—spontaneously admitted—the negro to a participation in all the privileges enjoyed by themselves. Was it necessary to remind their Lordships of the difference between the conduct of the colonists and the more unimpassioned legislators in the mother country. He would ask what time elapsed between the proposition for the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, supported as it was by the greatest Statesmen and Orators of which the country could ever boast, and the final removal of the disabilities which the law imposed on them? Why, from the debates in the year 1805, when one of the strongest Ministries the country had ever seen was compelled to yield to popular prejudice on this subject, full twenty-five years elapsed before those prejudices were overcome. What had, however, been the conduct of the West Indians? From the year 1823, not seven years were suffered to elapse before they spontaneously removed all disabilities on account of caste; and although no general election had taken place since that removal, he could assure their Lordships that a brown man was now the Representative of one of the most opulent parishes in which his estates were situated; and he had heard that another gentleman of colour also occupied a seat in the assembly. The triumph over all prejudice, in this instance, was complete. The amalgamation of the two colours in the enjoyment of all social advantages was speeding onwards, and he had little doubt, if their Lordships, the Legislature, and the Government, would have but a little patience and abstinence from violence, that the solution of the problem would at length be perfect, and that all which the most strenuous abolitionist could require would be effected through the gradual progress of civilization. He might enumerate other instances of the superior degree of liberality exhibited by the colonial legislatures, compared with that of the mother country. An hon. Member of the House of Commons had introduced a Bill for removing the disabilities of the Jews during the last year. Their Lordships knew the fate of that bill—while the Assembly of Jamaica had, on the contrary long since removed all civil distinctions between the Jews and any other class of their fellow citizens. He might enumerate many other instances of the same spirit, but it was scarcely necessary. Did the Government suppose that it could carry into effect the Resolutions for the emancipation of the slaves without the assistance of the colonists? If it did, it was mistaken. It could effect nothing beneficial without their cordial co-operation. Nay more, he would say that its efforts in hostility to them would only beget exasperation, and delay the accomplishment of its own wishes; and he thought these instances sufficiently proved that the planters themselves were willing to aid in the improvement of the condition of their slaves. He would beg leave to quote to their Lordships the conclusion of Mr. Canning's speech on this subject. Mr. Canning, on summing up, said, "If we are to do good (which I earnestly hope and sincerely believe we may), it is not to be done by sudden and violent measures, but by efforts of a patient and comparatively tame character; by measures slow in their progress, but steady and sure in their operation; measures which must be carried into effect, not by a few individuals of rare talents and conspicuous zeal, but by the great body of those whom the advocates of the negro distrust and seem disposed to put aside. Yes, Sir, if the condition of the slave is to be improved, that improvement must be introduced through the medium of his master. The masters are the instruments through whom and by whom, you must act upon the slave population:—and if by any proceedings of ours we shall unhappily place between the slave and his master the barrier of insurmountable hostility, we shall at once put an end to the best chance of emancipation or even of amendment. Instead of diffusing gradually over those dark regions a pure and salutary light, we may at once kindle a flame only to be quenched in blood.*" It might be thought, perhaps, by some of their Lordships, that this was but a doubtful authority, since this very speech had been quoted by the noble Lord who was the organ of Government in the other House of Parliament. He quoted it, however, because he attached great weight to the authority of Mr. Canning, though not more than, he believed, it deserved, or than it was admitted to deserve by every man of sense. Be the authority, however, what it might, the observations were so rational as to need no name to recommend them. He could support them by the authority of another great man, whose name, he was sure would have great weight with many of their Lordships, and particularly with some of the Members of the Cabinet, whose principles too would give weight to what he said—he meant that great statesman Mr. Fox, who said in one of his speeches on the question of the abolition of slavery, "That the idea of an Act of Parliament to emancipate the slaves without the consent and concurrent feelings of all parties, both in the colonies and in this country, could only lead to the most mischievous consequences. It would be totally extravagant in theory and impossible in execution." The Order in Council, as it was intended to be enforced by Government, seemed to him to be a measure to which the language of Mr. Fox would apply. He wished the Government to follow Mr. Fox's advice, and not endeavour to emancipate the slaves, unless it carried with it the consent and concurrent feelings of all parties interested in the colonies, as well as in this country. He appealed to the noble Viscount to remember the words of Mr. Canning, and profit by the warning he had given; for already the flame had been kindled, and had been extinguished in blood. They had found the inconvenience—they had suffered some of the threatened calamities—and let them be careful that it did not again occur and extend to other islands. He conjured them to attend to the prophetic warning he had quoted, and not allow the opinions of some individuals hostile to the colonists to induce them to persist in measures likely to be attended with such dreadful consequences. He conjured them to begin the work of conciliation; to see with their own eyes, and they would find that there was less reason to complain than was sometimes stated. He conjured them to take the present opportunity of a change of Government in one island to begin a different system, to send out his noble friend, who was going to govern Jamaica, with the olive branch, that he might adopt conciliatory measures with the legislature of the island, bring back the slaves to subordination, and re-establish security of property, and, perhaps, restore that prosperity which had formerly existed. He certainly should support his noble friend's Motion. The knowledge possessed by the people of this country relating to the situation of the inhabitants of the colonies was not correct and the West Indies themselves desired and courted inquiry.

---

* See Hansard's Debates, (New Series,) vol. x. p. 1109.

The Archbishop of *Canterbury* felt it necessary to say a few words in answer to the appeal which had been made to him by the noble Lord who had just sat down. When he was Bishop of London he was at the same time President of a Society for the Conversion of the Negro Slaves; and, looking forward as he did towards the final emancipation of the negroes, he thought that great end would be most accelerated by the application of the funds of the Society towards the moral improvement and religious instruction of the slaves. In pursuance of this feeling, he then considered it necessary to call upon the great body of the public to come forward, and, by subscriptions, to lend their aid towards the attainment of the object which he had at heart; a call which had been most liberally and instantaneously obeyed, not only by the public at large, but in particular by those whose property was situated in those islands. Since the course which he had taken had been adopted, there was a great improvement visible in the islands, and the appointment of a Bishop and of resident clergy had mainly aided in forwarding the religious and moral improvement of the slave population, to which the inhabitants themselves had given great support by contributing towards the funds for the maintenance of the clergy. In fact, so rapid were the advances made, that in fifteen years there were a greater number of churches and places of worship built in those islands than had ever been known to be established within the same period of time in any other country; and, in proof of the sums of money laid out, he might adduce the fact, that the loss in Barbadoes by the damage which the public schools and churches had sustained by the late hurricane, would require no less a sum to repair it than 40,000*l.* Facts like these he might cite in proof of what had already been done towards the amelioration of the moral and religious condition of the slaves as a preparative towards the enjoyment of freedom. There were now, he believed, in the colonies, as many clergymen as were necessary for the religious instruction of the people, and schools were everywhere established for the education of the blacks, the people of colour, and the poor whites —which latter were the most wretched persons in the colonies. For the advancement of these objects, the inhabitants had subscribed to an extent which was hardly to be expected. He begged to express his thanks in particular to the noble Lord (Seaford) for the assistance which he had rendered the Society to which he had just referred.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, in consequence of the assent given by the noble Lord to the Motion of his noble friend, he should not have troubled their Lordships with any observations, but for some remarks made by the noble Viscount. He had heard with great satisfaction the able and impressive statement made by the noble Lord who had last addressed their Lordships, as well as the observations of the most reverend Prelate, in support of the views taken by the noble Lord upon a point so important as the religious instruction of the slaves. It was natural that the West-India body, whether they resided in this country or in the Islands, should desire that a solemn inquiry should be instituted into the circumstances of their present condition. They were suffering great distress, brought on by a long-continued course of neglect—by many misfortunes, and now, at last, by a most formidable rebellion adding to their other misfortunes, and quite destroying the value of their property: besides which, he thought they had some reason to complain both of their conduct having been misapprehended, and of the acts of the Government at home, founded upon that misapprehension. He conceived that these reasons were sufficient to induce their Lordships to grant an inquiry into the circumstances of their situation, and into the acts of the Government at home with respect to the Legislatures of the Islands. It was natural that the West-India body should desire such an inquiry, and it could not be possible but that such an inquiry, conducted as it would be by their Lordships, must lead to results satisfactory to that body and the public. He would first state, that the question more immediately under consideration had been introduced in 1823 to the notice of the Legislature of this country; and what had been said that night was not altogether correct. It had been stated, that since that period nothing had been done by the legislatures of the colonies; but he would affirm, that there was not one of the colonial legislatures which had not taken some steps to carry into execution the resolutions of the Legislature of this country. Every step which had been required by the Parliament had been taken by some one or other of the colonial legislatures, with the exception of the Resolution relative to compulsory manumission, and against that they had appealed to the Privy Council. He must say, therefore, that the party of the colonists had some reason to complain, when it was stated, that they had taken no measures to carry into effect the Order in Council. It was equally clear that the other party had some reason to believe that all these orders might be carried into effect, since most of them were in some place or other, but they should wait till they could be adopted. Under these circumstances, he must confess that he had always considered that, sooner or later, everything that party wished, everything they could reasonably desire, would be done in time by the colonial legislatures, if the Parliament persevered in pressing on their attention those measures, without employing any violence, and avoiding all disposition to quarrel or use harsh means. That was the principle on which the Government acted of which he had the honour to be a Member. In no instance had that Government endeavoured to force any measure on the colonial Legislature, further than by employing recommendations—urgent recommendations—to carry into effect the Resolutions of the Parliament of this country. The noble Lord had stated, that the only attempt which had been honestly made, was by the present Government. He did not think the late Government could be called dishonest. It had given its honest support to the Resolutions, and, as he said before, with the exception of the one point on which nothing had been done, these Resolutions had all been carried into effect in some one or other of the Islands. Orders in Council had been sent out, which, he thought, would settle the question, and he was satisfied would settle it, as far as the Crown colonies were concerned. He could not say what those Orders were; but, if the matter had been arranged in the Crown colonies, he had no doubt that it would soon have been settled also in the colonies with independent legislatures. It was the duty of the Government to legislate for the Crown Colonies by Orders in Council, but he had never heard of Orders in Council for the other colonies. They could require Orders in Council to be obeyed in the Crown colonies, but he had never heard of such Orders being enforced in those colonies which had legislatures of their own. When he was in office, certainly it was never intended to enforce those Orders on these latter colonies; but only, by way of example, to show them, from what was done in the Crown colonies, that no danger was likely to ensue from their adopting the Orders in Council. Moderate and slow measures were more likely to be beneficial, as had been stated by the noble Lord (Seaford) and supported by the authority of Mr. Canning and Mr. Fox, than hasty and violent measures. Parliament had never intended to extinguish slavery by any other than a slow progress, cautiously adapted to circumstances. It had never intended by force to extinguish slavery; for that was, in the present circumstances of the colonies, to extinguish property. It never was intended to extinguish slavery and property together, and not give a compensation to the owners of that property. He had hoped for an amelioration of slavery by the means proposed; he had hoped that the condition of the slaves would be much but gradually improved, and that slavery would be gradually extinguished; but the Parliament had never contemplated the compulsory extinction of slavery, or anything which was to destroy the property of the proprietors. That was the view taken by Mr. Canning; and any Government which attempted to enforce the extinction of slavery by Orders in Council went beyond its duty. He had heard of enforcing those Orders by fiscal regulations—a measure which ought never to be adopted. Those islands which did not obey the Orders were to be taxed, while those which did were to escape. Did any person ever hear of taxes being enforced for such a purpose before? He thought taxes were imposed only for the service of the State. If they were necessary for the service of the State, in God's name let them be paid; but, if they were not necessary, they ought not to be paid, and the Legislature ought not to impose them; above all, it ought not to impose them as a punishment. Parliament was not justified in imposing them on any such principle. But on whom was this punishment to be inflicted? Why, we should have to pay these taxes, and the people of England would actually have to pay the taxes which were awarded as a punishment to the West-Indians. He could not believe that the Legislature would adopt such a proposition, if it were made by Government, for it was such a one as had never yet been recognized by Parliament. He was not surprised, under such circumstances, that the West-India body desired that the whole matter should be inquired into by a Committee of that House, in order that the inquiries might lead to doing them justice, and to ascertaining what part of the measures recommended by Parliament they had carried into execution. There were other reasons why this subject required serious attention. Their interest had been much neglected. No doubt whatever could be entertained that the taxation on their produce was excessive, for, with the exception of the small reduction made in 1829, that taxation had been reduced very little below what it was during the war. That alone was a sufficient reason for inquiry, to see if there were no means of giving the West-Indians relief. Let their Lordships look at the situation of property in that country. He would state to them the particulars of one property in the island of Jamaica which was fortunately unincumbered with any debts, which was the case with very few estates. The property consisted of 996 acres, whereof 176 acres were cultivated with sugar. The whole produce of the estate was sold in England for 6,010*l.*, and what proportion of that did their Lordships suppose went to Government? The duty of Government amounted to 2,960*l.*, being fifty per cent on the value of the gross produce. The expenses of agency, brokerage, insurance, &c. amounted to 1,000*l.*; it cost that to transport the sugar by sea to England. The supplies sent out from England for the estate amounted to 772*l.* There was money sent to the agent at Jamaica for various expenses, amounting to 564*l.* Altogether the whole of the disbursements amounted to 5,282*l.*, leaving to the proprietor the sum only of 728*l.* This was in a good year: in an ordinary year he would not get more than 500*l.* If the season were bad, or if the crops failed, he got nothing. It was most desirable that all these facts should be investigated by a Committee of that House. It was very desirable that property in the West Indies, like all individual property, should receive protection. It ought to be protected by the Legislature as well as any other property of individuals which existed in this country. The House, in its anxiety to abolish the slavery of individuals, should not forget that the subject involved, not merely the slavery of the negroes, but the property of individuals, and property entitled to their Lordships' protection. The public mind ought to be carried back to the nature of this property, and be made aware of what the consequences would be, not only to individuals, but to the property of the people generally, by any measures for carrying into effect by force the Resolutions for the abolition of slavery. It was a fact and truth that it would be the destruction of individual property to extinguish slavery. Without the slaves that property would be worth nothing for the owners; without slavery, it must be admitted that neither the owners, the public, nor the individuals engaged in the cultivation, could be sustained in life. It was surely time for their Lordships to make inquiry, and bring forward such a Report as would lay the whole matter clearly before the public. He would support the Motion of his noble friend, and should be prepared to give every assistance in his power to further the objects of the Committee.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that this was a very important question, and he could not allow it to pass without offering a few observations, the more particularly as he differed from the noble Duke who had just addressed the House, upon one or two points. He not only did not intend, but he would purposely avoid, entering into any discussion upon many of the topics to which the noble Duke, and the noble Lord (Seaford) had adverted. He understood that it was the intention of Government, in compliance with what they believed to be the sense of a majority of the House, to consent to the appointment of a Committee; and it appeared to him to be at least premature to enter upon a discussion with respect to matters which would become the subject of inquiry before that Committee. He would merely make one or two observations with the view of guarding those who had listened to the noble Duke and the noble Lord from being led away by the misconceptions which they appeared to entertain upon some important branches of this question. In the first place, those noble Lords had quoted the opinions of Mr. Canning and Mr. Fox. To the authority of the latter he was more disposed to yield upon this and all other questions, than to that of any other statesman, whose example or sayings were usually quoted. Really one would have thought, to have heard the noble Lord quote from a speech of Mr. Fox relative to a measure for the compulsory emancipation of slaves, and to apply that quotation in reprobation of the orders in Council which the Government had lately enforced in the Crown colonies, and recommended for the adoption of colonies having legislatures, that the object of those Orders in Council was to compel the manumission of slaves. Every man must admit, even if not backed by the authority of Mr. Fox, that it would be a wild and an unjust measure, suddenly, and without waiting to the very last moment, when it was possible for the mother country to bear with the colonies, to try to enforce the emancipation of the slaves. The measures, however, which the Government had enforced in the Crown colonies, and which they had recommended to the chartered colonies, had for their object only the preparation of the black population for the state of liberty to which they must ultimately arrive. Those measures, however, he feared, the chartered colonies would not adopt. This led him to say a word or two with respect to what had fallen from the noble Duke, relative to those chartered colonies. The noble Duke stated, that there was not one of those colonies in which some one or other of the propositions sanctioned by Parliament in 1822 had not been adopted. Now, as there were fourteen or fifteen of those propositions, and fourteen or fifteen colonies, it was quite clear, that, admitting the noble Duke's statement to be correct to the utmost extent, the colonies might, after all, have effected little or nothing. Two or three of Mr. Canning's resolutions contained important recommendations. The recommendations contained in the other resolutions, though still of some importance, were comparatively of inferior interest. It might happen that the important recommendations, had been adopted in some of the colonies of the least importance. He would not be tempted into details, but this he believed would, upon examination, be found to be the case. The noble Duke was likely to fall into mistakes in discussing this question, as most persons who had not had long experience of West-India affairs, and of colonial legislatures, had done before him. The West-India legislatures were too apt to legislate for the purpose of evasion, seeming to do that which they had no intention of performing, and doing just so much as would enable their advocates in this country to prevent the Government from carrying into effect the unanimous Resolutions of both Houses of Parliament. He would give an example of this conduct. There was one recommendation contained in Mr. Canning's Resolutions, which was so easy of execution that it might have been enforced in a week—indeed, it could execute itself—he meant the proposition for making slave evidence admissible. In most of the colonies this recommendation had, in some degree, been adopted by the legislatures. Acts had been passed, which were entitled "Acts to render slave evidence admissible." It was possible that the noble Earl, and other persons in this country, might suppose from this that the colonies were carrying into effect the recommendations of the Imperial Parliament. It was true that, according to their Acts, they rendered slave evidence admissible, but they fettered their indulgence with restrictions, which rendered it inoperative. In some cases it was rendered necessary that a slave should produce a certificate from the clergyman of the parish in which he lived, describing him as a proper person to give evidence. This was a most extraordinary proceeding. No person in this country ever dreamed that the colonial legislatures would be called upon to do more than to render the evidence of slaves admissible, whilst it would be reserved for the Court and the Jury to decide upon the weight and credibility of their evidence. In most cases slaves had not the happiness of living under the superintendence of clergymen of the established Church; and, as it was well known that great prejudices existed in the colonies against sectarian ministers, it was not likely that a certificate from one of the latter would facilitate the admission of a slave's evidence. In some cases, however, still further restrictions were imposed; for, before slaves could appear as witnesses in a court of justice, they were compelled to produce the certificate of the overseer of the plantation on which they worked, stating that they were fit and proper persons to give evidence, and that they duly understood the nature of an oath. Yet it was as against that overseer that it was important that the slaves should be made competent witnesses, it being for the very purpose of checking any misconduct on his part towards them that made the admissibility of slave evidence so desirable. Thus much he had felt it necessary to say, but, for the reason which he had before stated, he would not enter into further discussion on that occasion. With respect to the late insurrection which had taken place in Jamaica, no man could lament it more than he did; but, at the same time, he must altogether deny that that insurrection in any way arose from the measures adopted by the Government in connexion with the colonies. As to the inquiry that was asked for, he was of opinion that it was unnecessary, and that no benefit to the West-India interests would be derived from it; but, at the same time, the picture that was drawn of the distressed condition of the islands made him most unwilling to refuse that which it was supposed would be of advantage; and he, therefore, was ready to give his consent to the appointment of the Committee. There was one thing, however, of which he was quite sure, that the effect of the inquiry of the Committee would be, to show that the noble Duke had been altogether misinformed as to what had been done in the colonies, and what had been omitted there. His noble friend had alluded to the speech of Mr. Canning in 1824: now, with respect to the conclusions which his noble friend had drawn from that speech, he could not altogether concur in them; but, at all events, whatever interpretation might be put upon the observations of the right hon. Gentleman, he would take leave to observe, that what might be a very good argument in 1824 might be a very bad argument in 1832, owing to the change of circumstances that might have taken place.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, he had stated on former occasions his motives for not concurring in the Resolutions which passed the House of Commons in 1823, which, after an interval of three years, were sent up to their Lordships. His principle reason for the course he had then adopted was, that, going as far as any of the advocates for emancipation in his abhorrence of slavery, he was unwilling to pledge Parliament in so solemn a manner, without being satisfied, before doing so, of the means that could be found to enable them to redeem such pledges—if the admonitions and advice of Parliament should not be successful. Such means had, in his opinion not been hitherto discovered and acted upon, and the Resolutions themselves had only tended to fetter the proceedings, and to prevent the Legislature from dealing with the colonies according to the state of the case, as circumstances might arise upon an enlarged view of the whole matter. There was a statement in the latter part of the speech of the noble Viscount at the head of the Colonial Department, which, backed as it was by the remarks of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, had created great doubts in his mind as to the propriety of appointing a Committee, as it seemed to be the opinion of those noble Lords that such an appointment was unnecessary, and the Motion proposing it unfortunate. Certainly if Government intended to hamper the proceedings of the Committee by not leaving them at liberty to deal with the whole question; if they intended, notwithstanding any report it might make, founded on evidence produced before them, or the effect it was likely to produce on the public mind, to enforce their Orders in Council, and coerce the colonies by fiscal expedients, then the appointment of the Committee would be a delusion; and, so far from producing benefits to the colonies, it would bring conflicting and hostile feelings into contact, would rewaken animosities that might otherwise have slumbered, and would produce all the evils they were desirous to avoid. For his part,therefore, unless he distinctly understood that it was the intention of Government to leave the whole question to the Committee, and be guided by their decisions; he could not agree to its appointment. He said so, not because he thought under ordinary circumstances, it was right for Ministers to shelter themselves under the authority and report of a Committee, but because the whole proceedings founded upon Mr. Canning's resolutions went upon the principle of applying to Parliament for council in any inferior measures that might be necessary. It was never the intention of Mr. Canning, so far as could be gathered from his speeches, to proceed one step without the authority of the Legislature. But what had been the conduct of Ministers? How different had it been from that which would have been, in all probability, pursued by Mr. Canning, who always treated this as a fearful question. He considered that a single incautious expression used either by a Minister, or by parties opposed to him, might lead to bloodshed, and to the commission of the greatest atrocities, in the West-Indies. He felt he was treading on most dangerous ground in touching this question at all; and it was quite evident, from the spirit which pervaded all his speeches, that he never looked forward to proceeding by means of coercion, under the circumstances which had occurred since the period when his resolutions were passed. He (Lord Ellenborough) was satisfied that the moment they began to coerce the legislatures of the West-Indies, that moment they would sanction insurrection against the planters. They had lately had a terrible instance of the effects of a delusion on the part of the black population—such delusions were easily excited. The peril in which the white population at all times stood, in the midst of so much ignorance and combustible matter, was extreme. Could they doubt that, if the colonial legislatures, consisting chiefly, if not wholly, of the white population of the West-Indies, was placed in direct hostility with the parent state, which the slaves were made to believe protected them, from that moment, whatever might be their motives, they would be thought to sanction insurrection. Those who pursued that course would be responsible for all the evils which might flow from such an insurrection. They would see what had been the conduct of Government. About a year ago, Ministers came down to Parliament with resolutions to the effect of those expressed in the letter of the 10th of December. These resolutions were never carried; but, on the 10th of December, whilst Parliament was sitting, this Order in Council was issued to the West-Indian legislatures, pledging the Government, and Parliament, but without consulting the Legislature, to enforce the Orders in Council. This was directly contrary to the express pledge of Mr. Canning—directly contrary to that line of conduct which policy and reason should have dictated to the Government. When he had first heard that it was the intention of Ministers to grant this Committee, his belief was, that they had become aware of the error into which they had fallen; and wished to cover their retreat. But if, on the contrary, he was now to understand that his Majesty's Government intended to adhere to the line of conduct they had hitherto pursued, he agreed with the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, nay, he went beyond him, and not only thought the Committee unnecessary, but most unfortunate, and likely to be productive of very great public evils. He thought the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was mistaken if he supposed that, on the general subject involved in the discussion of to-night, he differed from the majority of this House. He believed that every noble Lord went quite as far as the noble and learned Lord in abhorrence of slavery, and in a desire to ameliorate the condition of the slaves, with a view to their ultimate emancipation. Their difference was not as to the object, but as to the means of accomplishing it. He denied that the Orders in Council made one step towards its attainment. It had been truly stated to have been the object of Mr. Canning to carry along with him the white population of the West Indies. Unless that population went along with the measures proposed, success was impossible; for, legislate as they pleased, they were the only instruments to carry the laws into effect. The new Order in Council threatening to coerce the chartered colonies by fiscal regulations, was a direct attack upon the independence of every one of them. They might as well, by order in Council, destroy their charters; for the effect of complying with these orders would be, practically, to place them in the same position as the Crown colonies. Did their Lordships know the nature of the Orders in Council, Ministers meant to enforce? Had they read the letter of Mr. Jackson, showing their gross absurdities, and that their effects would be actually to place the slave, in many instances, in a worse situation than he now held? Those Orders, he had no hesitation in saying, were founded in gross and utter ignorance of the state of the colonies. They applied to fourteen or fifteen different colonies, and yet required one uniform act of legislation. According to them, the slaves were everywhere to be clothed and fed in the same way, and to be subject to the same hours of labour, although variety of climate, and other circumstances, rendered it necessary, for the happiness of the slave and the security of the master, that there should be a difference in many of these particulars. But Ministers had not only departed from the principles laid down by Mr. Canning, and determined to act upon their own authority, but had been so unfortunate in selecting their occasion, that they had placed those against whom they were to act in the right. The colonists, undoubtedly were right in resisting the Orders in Council, for they were absurd, unreasonable, and injurious, and their Lordships were to be called upon to exert their powers of coercive legislation to make the colonists do what was plainly and demonstrably wrong. Under such circumstances, the thing could not stand. It was impossible that Parliament could support the Government in the course it was about to pursue, he, therefore, trusted the noble Viscount would hear reason, and allow the whole subject to go before the Committee; and if it could be shown that this Order in Council was inapplicable to particular islands, that he would consent to modify it, and further, that some pledge would be given that no measure of coercion whatever should be proposed, until it appeared, in the words of Mr. Canning, "that the opposition of the planters is founded not upon reason, but upon contumacy."

Viscount *Goderich* could not admit the interpretation which the noble Lord gave to Mr. Canning's language. He never understood that that language contained a pledge, that in no case, after no lapse of time, and under no circumstances, would the Government think itself justified in acting in a manner different to that he then prescribed. When the noble Lord called upon him to give some sort of pledge, with respect to the conduct of the Government, whilst this inquiry was pending, he seemed to think he had a strange notion of his duty; that he was about to accede to the appointment of a Committee, with a predetermination to disregard and despise every tittle of evidence that might be produced before it. Although he did not wish that Committee to be appointed, and doubted its expediency, yet his sole object, if he were a Member of it, would be the investigation of truth; that being the principle on which he proposed to act, contained as much of a pledge as any Member of that House ought to be called upon to give

Lord *Wynford* said, that his noble and learned friend on the woolsack had stated, that, although the colonies had passed laws in seeming compliance with the wishes of this country, yet, they had taken care that those laws should be such as to produce very little effect; however he was glad his noble and learned friend had only adduced one instance of this kind, had there been another, from his great knowledge of West-Indian affairs, he must have known it, and he was sure he would have brought it forward. The only instance he did state related to the admission of slave evidence, which he said was tramelled by the acts directing, that before a slave was examined, he must have a certificate from some minister of religion, and the overseer of the estate to which he belonged. He had ascertained, by inquiries made since his noble and learned friend made his statement, that he was entirely deceived as regarded a certificate being required from the overseer. It was true, that the slave was required to have a certificate from some minister of religion, but with whom did that provision originate but with Mr. Canning, who distinctly recommended it, and in consequence of whose recommendation it was adopted? so that that law, which his noble and learned friend stated had been passed to defeat the intentions of Parliament, had actually proceeded from the Minister upon whose resolutions all succeeding legislation had been founded. He thought it was a most wise provision; for, if slaves were to be received as witnesses in a Court of Justice, it must first be ascertained that they believed in the nature of an oath. But there was another point he would urge upon his noble and learned friend. If there was any objection to this law, how had it received the sanction of the British Government? As this was the only instance which his noble and learned friend had brought forward to prove attempts on the part of the colonists to do away with the effect of what they pretended to do in compliance with the wishes of the British Legislature, he had failed in making his case out. The noble and learned Lord had further stated, that he did not think that the expectations of the noble Duke, with respect to this Committee, would be realized, but that a very different case would be made out. He confidently hoped that his noble and learned friend would not prove correct in his opinion. Who applied for this Committee but the proprietors of property in the West Indies? They had been charged with many faults, but they had not been thought persons wanting in discretion, and, therefore, it was not likely that they would apply for this Committee, if they did not believe that the result of the inquiry would be in their favour. For his own part, he thought that the result would be to prove these Orders in Council unnecessary—and, if unnecessary, improper; for he agreed with the noble Lord (Lord Seaford) that any interference between master and slave, not absolutely necessary, was not only an improper interference with property, but an interference likely to lead to the most mischievous consequences, both to the whites and the blacks. When the noble and learned Lord said, that nothing had been done for the latter, did he forget the testimony which had been borne to the fact by the most rev. Archbishop? did the noble and learned Lord forget that, in 1815, the negroes were all Pagans, but that now they were nearly all Christians? He should have thought that making them Christians was conferring upon them the greatest boon it was possible to bestow; therefore, in his opinion, much had been done, as he trusted other noble Lords besides himself were fully persuaded, from what had occurred in the course of the debate. If their Lordships went into Committee, in the spirit so properly recommended by the noble Viscount opposite, it might turn out that everything had been done which, consistently with a due regard to the interest both of master and slave, could have been done for the benefit of the latter. He was glad to hear his noble friend say, that nothing like compulsory manumission was ever dreamed of. God forbid that there should be any thing like a forcing of the master to abandon his property in the slave! Once adopt that principle, and there was an end of all property. Property in slaves, in the West Indies, was acquired under the sanction of law—nay, more, under the encouragement of law; and, therefore, rested upon as good a foundation as any other property. That slavery was an evil, nobody could doubt; not on account of the relation which existed between masters and slaves in the West Indies, but on account of the criminality which belonged to it. He had not a sugar cane in the West Indies, but he should be sorry, upon principle, that the property of the West Indians should be assailed by a forced manumission of slaves. The Government ought to indemnify all who had acquired this kind of property, under the sanction of the Government.

The *Lord Chancellor* begged their Lordships to bear in mind that his noble and learned friend had said, that, in no colonial legislature had any law yet been passed, announcing, as a condition to the admissibility of slave evidence, that the certificate of the overseer was necessary; he had no doubt, however, that point would be completely proved in the Committee, and that his noble and learned friend and informant had misled him.

Petition to lie on the table.

The Earl of *Harewood* then moved, that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the laws and usages of the several West-India Colonies, in relation to the slave population; the actual condition and treatment of the slaves, their habits and dispositions; the means which are adopted in the several Colonies for their progressive improvement and civilization, and the degree of improvement and civilization which they have at present attained; and also to inquire into the distressed condition of those colonies.

Motion agreed to.

Arrears of Tithes (Ireland) Bill.] Viscount *Melbourne* moved the first reading of this Bill, the progress of which had been delayed by the pressure of other business. It had been his desire to see the Bill pass into a law previous to the recess, in order that it might afford a practical refutation of an erroneous opinion which prevailed in Ireland, that tithes were extinguished. This delusion, he was sorry to say, had caused resistance to the payment of tithes to show itself in districts which had not been before subject to any commotion or disturbance. Their Lordships were aware that it was the intention of the Tithe Committee to recommend some measure for providing a maintenance for the clergy of Ireland, more secure, more free from objections, and more reconcileable with the feelings of the country, than the existing system of tithes; but at present the law remained unaltered, and he wished it to be understood that the claim for tithe was legal, and resistance to it unjustifiable and contrary to law.

Bill read a first time.

Adjourned until Monday, the 7th of May.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, April 18, 1832.

Minutes.] Bills brought in. By the Lord Advocate, to settle and describe the Boundaries of Cities, Burghs, and Towns in Scotland, in so far as respects the return of Members to Parliament:—By Mr. Mackinnon, to Consolidate and Amend several Laws relating to the Cruel Treatment of Cattle:—By Mr. Loch, to enable Burghs in Scotland to Establish a General System of Police:—By Mr. Vernon Smith, to Regulate the Office of the Clerk of the Crown in the Court of King's Bench in Ireland:—By Lord Tullamore, for holding the Assizes in the King's County in Ireland twice every year.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Hume, of the Number of Ships which passed the Sound during the year 1831, distinguishing their respective Nations; of the Number of Loads of Timber imported from the Baltic in each year, from 1827 to 1831, inclusive of the Number of Vessels, with the Amount of Tonnage which cleared out for the Deep Sea Fishery between 1827, and 1831; of the Tonnage of Vessels employed in the Coasting Trade which had entered in or cleared out during the same time; of a Letter from Mr. Hay, dated the 5th of March last, referred to in a Treasury Minute assigning Superannuation to Mr. Justice Stephen; of the Number of Parishes in Ireland, the Tithes of which are received by the Clergy of the Established Church, specifying their Names and Rank, the Amount of Income which each derived from such Parish if under the Composition Act, or, if not under the said Act, the Sum paid on an average of three years, distinguishing whether the Tithes be Rectorial or Vicarial, or if the Income is derived from Land allotted; of the Number of Stamps issued to each of the Newspapers and Advertizing Papers in Scotland in the year 1831; and an Account of the Advertisement Duty paid by each Paper in the same year; of the date of the Commission appointing Commissioners of Inquiry into the Charities of England under 1 and 2 Will. 4th, stating the Names and Emoluments of the Commissioners, and of all Persons attached to their Offices:—On the Motion of Mr. Spring Rice, Report from the King's Proctor to the Lords of the Treasury, dated the 30th June, 1831, on the subject of the Compensation proposed for the Owners of the Ship *Almorah*, on account of the detention of that Vessel:—On the Motion of Mr. Ruthven, of the Number of Sturdy Beggars received into the Workhouse at Cork during the last twenty years; Foundlings remaining in the Establishment on the 1st of March, 1832; Children received from each Parish in the City during the last two years, with the Income, and Expenditure, from what Sources the Revenue is derived, and how the same was Expended; the same Returns for Waterford and Limerick:—On the Motion of Mr. Wilkes, Return of all Religious Teachers and Missionaries, who had been Arrested during the present year at Jamaica, with the Charges against them, and all Accounts of Injuries to Places of Worship by Riotous Assemblages in the said Island, and all Proclamations issued thereon, and an Abstract of the Laws now in force as to Churches, Chapels, and other Places of Worship, and relating to the Ministers and Congregations meeting in the same:—On the Motion of Mr. Dixon, Copy of Memorandum entered into between Lord Ponsonby, and the Brazilian Government, dated May, 1829, relating to the Capture and Detention of British Vessels; of the Alienations of Crown Lands in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, respectively, during the last ten years:—On the Motion of Mr. Sadler, of the Number of Burials in Manchester, from the years 1821, to 1830, inclusive, distinguishing each year:—On the Motion of Mr. Godson, of the Number of Footpaths and Roads stopped up in the Parish of Berkhampstead, between June, and August, 1827.

Petitions presented. By Mr. Ruthven, from the Inhabitants of Bangor, in favour of the New System of Education in Ireland:—By Mr. Dominic Browne, from the Guild of Nailers in Galway, for Equalizing Civil Rights in that Place; and from the Catholics of the Guild of Tanners, Magistrates, and Merchants of Galway of the same Religion, for the Repeal or Modification of the Stamp Duties on the Admission of Freemen to Corporations; and from the Inhabitants of Cong, for the Abolition of Tithes:—By Mr. Spring Rice, from the Clergy, Gentry, and other Persons, residing in Ashbourne, Ratoath, and other Places, complaining of the Rates of the Tolls on the Roads in the Counties of Dublin and Meath; from the Landed Proprietors and other Rate-payers of the County of Tyrone, complaining of the present System of Taxation; by Grand Juries from the Physicians and Surgeons of the County of Down, complaining of the Law for Regulating the Admission of Medical Persons to County Infirmaries in Ireland; from the President and Fellows of King and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland, for their Rights to be preserved in any Enactments on the subject of Anatomy; from the Corporation of Dover, against the Sewers Bill:—By Mr. Mackinnon, from the Inhabitants of Saffron Walden, and of Inhabitant Householders of Westminster, in favour of the Cruelty to Animals Bill:—By Lord Morpeth, from the Merchants of Leeds, complaining of their Vessels being Captured by the Brazilians:—By Mr. Shaw Lefevre, from the Inhabitants of Alton, for the Removal of the Punishment of Death for Offences against Property:—By Mr. Wilkes, from the Inhabitants of South Lincoln, for the Abolition of Slavery:—By Mr. Vernon Smith, from the Protestant Dissenters and Inhabitants of Northampton, in favour of the Registration of Births Bill:—By the Earl of Belfast, from the Minister and Congregation of the Presbyterian Churches of Ballymeney and Randalstown:—By Lord Castlereagh, from Board Mills; and by an Hon. Member, from the Presbytery of Aberdeen, against the New System of Education in Ireland.

TITHES (IRELAND).] Mr. *Dominic Browne* presented a Petition from the Parish of Cong, in the County of Galway, praying for the abolition of Tithes. Though he had supported, he said, the measure of the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, yet he always was of opinion, and he still retained that opinion, that the connexion between England and Ireland could not be maintained, unless the revenues of the church of Ireland were reduced in proportion to the number of the members belonging to that church in that country; and he thought that a reduction, to the amount at least of one-sixth, should be made in those revenues. At the same time, as long as a tax was legal it must be collected, and it was on that principle he had given his support to the Tithe Bill.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—PETITIONS.] Lord *Castlereagh* presented a Petition from Bangor in the County of Down, against the new system of Education in Ireland. The meeting from which it emanated, had been called upon a clear understanding that it should be attended by those only who were opposed to the system; notwithstanding which the room was filled by persons who formed it into a political meeting, and under the pretence that the promoters of it were opposed to Reform, assailed the respectable gentlemen who had assembled for a different object, with most violent language, when Lord Dufferein who was chairman adjourned the meeting to another place, at which the petition he had now the honour to present was carried by a large majority.

Mr. *Ruthven* was aware that some disturbance had taken place at the meeting, but it was in consequence of the manner in which the requisition was drawn up; besides which, there was an advertisement issued, calling upon all the inhabitants who loved the Bible and wished their children to be instructed from it, and who desired the temporal and eternal welfare of their offspring, to be present. The consequence was, a numerous attendance, and certainly many persons assembled to show that the plan was not opposed to the reading of the Scriptures in the schools. The gentleman who offered himself for that purpose was cut short by the chairman, who observed, that he did not come to hear speeches but to receive signatures. In consequence of that remark, great rudeness had been offered to the chairman (Lord Dufferein), which he did not attempt to justify. The result, however, was, that his Lordship left the meeting and went to another place. Of what had there occurred, he pretended to give no account; but at the original meeting, another gentleman was called to the chair, and a petition was agreed to in favour of the plan, which had received quite as many signatures as that against it, and had it been hawked about in the same manner as the one presented by the noble Lord, he had no doubt the signatures would have been much more numerous. The question had provoked discussion; and persons found they had been deluded, and that the new system would by no means prevent a scriptural education.

Colonel *Evans* was authorized to say, that a petition against the Government plan of national education in Ireland, which had been presented as the result of a public meeting of the inhabitants of Manchester, had emanated from a packed meeting of some 200 persons at the most, and who were only admitted by tickets.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* defended the promoters of the Manchester petition against the charges which had been made against them by the hon. and gallant member for Rye (Colonel Evans) and stated that the meeting at which it originated, was not called for the discussion of affairs in general, but for a specific purpose; that this purpose was publicly stated, and that no one had a right to force his sentiments upon a meeting so constituted. With respect to what had been stated by the hon. member for Downpatrick, that hon. Gentleman had answered his own speech by substantially admitting what had been said by the noble Lord (Castlereagh) against the ruffianly conduct of the parties alluded to. This was another example of the attempts to promote the Government plan of education. Hisses; groans; "No Tories;" "Down with the Tory Lord;" "We can now do without Lords;" "I'm as good a Lord as you are;" these were meet arguments, and they were generally used in support of such a system. Before he sat down, he had to complain of the great and serious inconvenience to which they were subjected on the presentation of petitions. It amounted, in fact, to the repression of public feeling upon subjects of the greatest importance. He had daily attended the ballot at ten o'clock for nearly three months, and in the whole course of that time he had not obtained more than three or four opportunities for presenting petitions intrusted to him. The consequence was, that he had at that moment, upwards of forty in his possession. On his own behalf, therefore, and on the behalf of numbers who were similarly circumstanced, he gave notice that, if the House did not come to some understanding in favour of a better arrangement, he should move a resolution on the subject immediately after the Easter recess.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that the inconvenience complained of was very generally felt, and observed that the custom of presenting petitions ought to be taken into consideration, with a view to the adoption of some plan by which the public business might be facilitated. He must also notice the fact, of a House not having formed yesterday. If that were done designedly by the Government, he thought, in the present pressure of business, that it was much to blame.

The Marquis of *Chandos* fully concurred with the right hon. Baronet. The practice of not making a House, looked like a plan of the Government to avoid unpleasant discussions.

Lord *Althorp* said, it was his anxious desire that the House should have met yesterday, and he had himself suffered inconvenience from the circumstance, having had a motion to bring forward on the subject of the Bank Charter. He agreed that some arrangement should take place with regard to the presentation of petitions, and expressed his willingness to assist in any arrangement which would tend to facilitate the presentation of petitions, in order to expedite the general business.

Lord *John Russell* said, that after the recess, he proposed to present two petitions in favour of the plan of education about to be adopted in Ireland. He was of opinion that it would not be desirable to prevent discussion on the presentation of petitions. He thought it would be a good plan that all petitions on the subject, for instance, of Irish education, should follow one another.

Sir *Robert Peel* suggested that the subject of the presentation of petitions should be referred to a Committee, upon whose report the House might act. The consequence of the present system was, that petitions tending to inflame the passions of the people, took precedence of those of a grave, important, and domestic description. He gave notice, that after the recess, he would move for the appointment of a Committee on the subject.

Mr. *Robinson* complained of the mode pursued by Government of keeping back Members for the purpose of preventing the formation of a House. He did not believe the absence of Members was accidental, and if such practices were persevered in he would find a means of retorting.

Sir *Matthew White Ridley* denied that any such course was pursued by his Majesty's Government.

Petition to lie on the Table

POLAND.] Lord Althorp moved that the House at its rising do adjourn to May 7th.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* said, in pursuance of the notice he had given, he thought that was a proper time for him to bespeak the attention of the House, while he made some few remarks relating to the state of Poland. It was not a subject to which he felt himself peculiarly adapted, as it required knowledge and information which he did not possess, to enable him to discharge the duty he had taken on himself. He could unfeignedly declare that no task he had ever undertaken had pressed more severely on his mind, and on no occasion had he more need of the indulgence of the House. The deep interest which he felt in the fate of unhappy and heroic Poland, had rendered it impossible for him, however inadequate he was to the task, not to lend such aid as he could offer, to bring the subject fairly before Parliament. Since he had given notice of his intentions, some delay had taken place owing to accidental circumstances, which he did not however regret, because it had given an opportunity for two important documents materially bearing upon the question to reach this country, without the aid of which the discussion must have been premature, and therefore incomplete. He alluded to the ukase or manifesto of the Emperor of Russia, and the statute of organization accompanying it, both dated the 26th of February last, by which the political existence and nationality of Poland were attempted to be extinguished. In neither of those documents was there any reference to the Treaty of Vienna. The right of the Emperor to rule over the country was made to rest not upon treaty but upon conquest. The proposition which he was about to submit to the House, and which would be discussed throughout Europe, was, that the Emperor of Russia held the sovereignty of Poland on the terms and conditions on which he received it from the Congress at Vienna, and by no other title, and on no other right. The great question was not merely a Russian or a Polish question, but it was a question common to all Europe, and it was one in which the honour and good faith of every Power, and of none more than Great Britain, were directly involved. If the House would refer to the proceedings that took place at the Congress of Vienna, it would be found, that the late Lord Castlereagh took the initiation, as it were, in the discussion: much to his honour, he made a manly stand for the restoration of the ancient territory and independence of Poland. Had he been supported as he ought to have been, Poland would, probably, have been restored to her ancient independence and rank among the nations of Europe. The House would perhaps bear with him, whilst he referred, not merely to the Treaty of Vienna itself, but to the previous proceedings that took place at the Congress. It was necessary to take a short review of a part of those proceedings, in order to put hon. Gentlemen in possession of the real state of the question, and to show that it was the bounden duty of Great Britain, in respect of her honour and her plighted faith, to do whatever might depend on her to prevent the threatened extinction of the nationality of Poland. At the Congress of Vienna, Lord Castlereagh, on behalf of England, required that ancient Poland should be restored to her independence and to all her territory. Finding that the object was not to be attained, he declared "that it was England's wish to see some independent Power (whether more or less in extent) established in Poland under a distinct dynasty of its own, and as a separation between the three great empires of Europe." Russia, as it might be believed, opposed this arrangement as far as respected the distinct dynasty; but the Emperor of Austria, at first, not only opposed the proposition of Russia, that the Duchy of Warsaw should be united to his empire, but touched perhaps with something akin to that feeling of remorse which was said to have haunted the breast of Maria Theresa to her dying day, for the part which she had taken in that flagitious act, the partition of Poland—the Emperor of Austria declared that he should be disposed to sacrifice some of his own possessions for the sake of the entire re-establishment of Poland as an independent kingdom. France was represented at the Congress by that eminent statesman and diplomatist, Prince Talleyrand, who took occasion in a note to Prince Metternich, dated December 19th, to express himself thus:—'Of all the 'questions to be discussed at this Congress, 'the King would, undoubtedly, consider 'the affair of Poland as incomparably the 'most important to the interests of Europe, 'if there be any chance (if he could hope 'as much as he wished) that this nation, 'so worthy of regard by its antiquity, its 'valour, its misfortunes, and the services 'it has formerly rendered to Europe, might 'be restored to complete independence.' It was, in truth, impossible ever to forget that Christendom was rescued and saved from the yoke of the barbarian, by John Sobieski and his heroic Poles; and without their aid, the Crescent of the Moslem might now be glittering in the church of St. Peter. But, to resume his narrative, it was, after much negotiation and compromise between the parties, agreed that the Duchy of Warsaw should be erected into a kingdom, and that Poland, thus constituted, should exist as a distinct independent state, having the same sovereign as Russia, and to be united to that empire, and bound to it by a constitution of its own. The House would listen, he was sure, with interest, to the words of Lord Castlereagh on that subject, in a note addressed by him to the committee for Polish and Saxon affairs, dated the 12th of January, 1813:—'Experience has 'shown, that the happiness of Poland and 'the tranquillity of this important portion 'of Europe, cannot be secured by thwarting the national customs and habits. An 'attempt of this kind would only excite 'amongst the Poles a spirit of disaffection 'and degradation; it would occasion re'volts, and awaken the remembrance of 'past misfortunes.' His Lordship then went on to entreat the sovereigns not to leave Vienna till they had agreed that the Poles, under whatever government they might be placed, should still be treated as Poles; and added, if that was effected, there would no longer be any fear of danger to the liberty of Europe from the union of Poland with the Russian empire, already so powerful—a danger which would not be imaginary, if the military force of the two countries should ever be united under the command of an ambitious and warlike monarch. On the 19th of January, the Russian plenipotentiary (Count Rasoumofski) replied, "that the just and liberal principles which the note contained, was received by his imperial majesty with the most cordial approbation, and that he had been delighted to recognise the generous sentiments which characterise the British nation, and the enlarged and enlightened views of its Government." Prince Hardenberg, on the part of Prussia, on the 20th of January, declared, "that the principles laid down by Lord Castlereagh, as to the method of governing the Polish provinces, were in perfect conformity with the sentiments of his Prussian Majesty on the subject." The Emperor of Austria, on the 21st of February, by his plenipotentiary, gave in a declaration to this effect, "That his conduct in the important negotiation, which had just determined the fate of the Duchy of Warsaw, could have left no doubt on the minds of the Allied Powers, that the re-establishment of Poland, as an independent state, with a national administration of its own, would have fully accomplished the wishes of his imperial majesty, and he would even have been willing to make the greatest sacrifice to obtain the restoration of that ancient and beneficial arrangement. The emperor having, in the course of the present negotiation, sacrificed his wishes, as to the restoration of Poland, to the important considerations which have induced the other Powers to sanction the union of the larger part of the Duchy of Russia with the Russian empire, his imperial majesty concurs, nevertheless, with the Emperor Alexander, in his liberal views, and approves of the national institutions which it is the intention of that monarch to grant to the Polish nation." And again, "Russia has declared that the best security for the repose and the vigour of nations, consists in the happiness of the people, and that this happiness is inseparable from the righteous care of the rulers over the nationality and customs of their subjects. The emperor is of opinion that he cannot better express the conformity of his own intentions, in the present instance, with the maxim laid down, than by directing the plenipotentiary to declare, that he entirely concurs with the sentiments expressed by Lord Castlereagh, in the memorial of the wishes of his court, as to the future lot of the Poles, and with the reply made on the 19th of January last, by the Emperor of Russia to that declaration." Would it, after this, be said, that the rights of this prince over Poland rested, not on treaty, but on conquest? What, then, were the rights of Poland as resting upon treaty? By positive stipulation, a constitution was guaranteed to that country; that constitution was formally given to it; and Russia could not destroy it, without committing an infraction of the treaty, and without forfeiting her faith, both to her own subjects and to the powers of Europe, parties of the treaty. He did not intend to detain the House by going into the two preliminary treaties between Russia and Austria, and Russia and Prussia, but would call its attention to the general act of the Congress of Vienna, which, after the preamble, run thus:—"Wishing now to comprise, in a single act, the results of their various negotiations, in order that they may receive the ratification of all, the contracting parties have authorised their plenipotentiaries to condense into one general act all arrangements of primary and permanent importance:" and this act was signed by no less than three persons on the part of Great Britain,—"Clancarty, Cathcart, Stewart, L.G." The first article was this:—"The Duchy of Warsaw (with exceptions afterwards mentioned) is united to Russia; it shall be irrevocably bound to the Russian empire by its constitution, to be enjoyed by his majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, his heirs and successors for ever. His imperial majesty reserves to himself the power of giving to that state, possessed of a distinct administration, the territorial extension which he shall deem fit. He will take with his other titles, that of Czar, King of Poland, according to the customary formula for his other possessions." There was then a provision for giving to the Polish subjects of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, a representation and national institution, but with which he would not trouble the House. At the period of the Treaty of Vienna, and for some short time after, the Emperor Alexander he believed was sincere in his intention of securing liberty to Poland; for, shortly afterwards, he promulgated the constitution of Poland, which certainly contained the foundation of as free a government as was to be found in any country in the world. It was in November, 1815, that the charter was given to Poland, and he would state to the House the terms in which the emperor expressed himself in a letter to Count Ostrouski, the President of the senate, on the 30th of April, 1815, which was just before the time when the Treaty of Vienna was to be signed:—'It is with peculiar 'satisfaction that I announce to you that 'the destiny of your country is about to 'be fixed by the concurrence of all the 'Powers assembled at the Congress of 'Vienna. The kingdom of Poland shall 'be united to the empire of Russia, by the 'title of its own constitution, on which I 'am desirous of founding the happiness of 'the country. If the great interests in'volved in general tranquillity, have not 'permitted all the Poles to be united under 'one sceptre, I have at least endeavoured, 'to the utmost of my power, to soften the 'hardships of the separation, and every'where to obtain for them, as far as prac'ticable, the enjoyment of their nationality.' At the time that the Emperor Alexander made use of these words, he was no doubt sincere in his intentions; but, very shortly after, he was induced, by the pernicious counsels of others, to adopt that course which his own heart condemned. Above all things, it was unfortunate for Poland, that there should have been sent to govern it a prince whose capricious and cruel acts were the main cause of the dreadful calamities which had lately befallen that unhappy land. There were no insults that Constantine did not offer to the inhabitants of Warsaw—there was no affront that he did not put upon the ancient nobility of the devoted nation—there was no breach of the Constitution that he did not commit—in short, such was his conduct, that he left no alternative to the Poles but that to which they at length resorted; for so far did he carry his acts of cruelty, oppression, and tyranny, that human endurance could bear it no longer, and the people rose in resistance. It was this brutal prince who continued to pursue his atrocious conduct till he left nothing for unfortunate Poland to do but that which her citizens afterwards did, not through the result of a regularly organized conspiracy of a few, but by a strong feeling of public indignation at the wrongs they had suffered, and the impossibility of longer submitting to a course of conduct so wantonly outrageous. The Grand Duke Constantine it was, who laid a train which one accidental spark ignited, and the flames of revolt enwrapped the whole kingdom of Poland. The Emperor of Russia gave to Poland a Constitution; which, having given, he could not take away without sufficient cause. The Emperor bound himself to maintain and preserve that Constitution, and the Poles swore allegiance, not to the Emperor alone, but to the Emperor and the Constitution. By that Constitution liberty of person was guaranteed—so was the liberty of the Press—the Diet was to be frequently convoked—the right of granting supplies was vested in the people—the nationality of Poland was to be preserved, and no Russians were to be placed in office—no Russian army was to be quartered in Poland, nor was any Russian army even to pass through the country without the whole expense being borne by Russia. Now, there was not one article of this compact that had not been grossly violated. The Polish Constitution was even more tender of personal liberty than that of England; for, by its provisions, if any man was apprehended for any cause whatever, he must, within three days, be brought before the regular authorities—must know his accusation and his accuser—and if there was not sufficient ground to detain him, he must be discharged. The independence of the Judges was also provided for; but all these provisions of the Constitution were shamefully trampled on by the Grand Duke, who confined within the fortresses, by his own authority alone, the most illustrious Poles, without ever bringing them before the Judges, or taking any legal proceedings whatever against them. Without the form of trial, he condemned the inhabitants of Warsaw, and degraded many of the highest of them to the office of cleaning away the dirt in the streets. As to the liberty of the Press, it did not exist for a single day. It was in every instance violated, and was made subject to restrictions wholly inconsistent with, and subversive of, its freedom. The rights of the people of Poland were disregarded, and the privileges of the Diet were constantly sacrificed. By the charter, a Diet was to be held at least once in two years—five years passed without any being assembled. The budget was to be submitted to the Diet once in four years—during fifteen years no budget was ever submitted to, deliberated upon, or voted by, that assembly; but everything relating to the subject was done arbitrarily and by royal decrees. According to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, it was clearly intended that the Russian troops were only to be admitted in particular cases, and in such cases they were to be supported by Russia; notwithstanding which, 10,000 Russian troops were permanently quartered at Warsaw, at the expense chiefly of the inhabitants, whilst they served to support the encroachments on Polish liberty. Again, the people had a right to attend the discussions in the two Chambers, for one of the articles specially stipulated that all the proceedings should be public; but, notwithstanding this, the doors were ordered to be closed, and the publicity of the debates suppressed by an ordinance of the Emperor. He was not one of those who estimated the importance of publicity at a low rate; he was convinced that, if the public were excluded from having cognizance of the debates in that House, the Constitution of England would not exist for twelvemonths: on that account he condemned most strongly this arbitrary proceeding on the part of the Emperor. The liberty of the subject, too, was constantly violated, and persons of all classes were imprisoned without any legal forms being observed. Members of the Diet were seized and imprisoned in consequence of the expression of their opinions in that capacity. One of them was condemned to perpetual imprisonment by a Commission nominated by the Grand Duke. Another, that distinguished man Vincent Niemoiewski, was confined to his own estate, for having expressed, in the Diet, opinions which were not contrary to the constitutional state of things as established by the Charter. In every important article, therefore, the Constitution had been grossly infringed, and by that infringement the insurrection was occasioned. He said, then, that, in the eyes of every nation in Europe, the Polish insurrection was fully justified. But, if it had been otherwise, he would contend that, when the insurrection was put down by force of arms, the Constitution still remained. The Government was not justified by the law of nations in taking away the Constitution. The actors in the insurrection had exposed themselves to punishment; but the nation and the Constitution were in the same position as before. He challenged any one conversant with the law of nations to maintain that an unsuccessful insurrection could justify the punishment of a whole nation. The Russians, however, had deprived four millions of Poles of their Constitution, and had punished a whole nation for the acts of a few men. Was this the conduct pursued by England towards Ireland after the Rebellion of 1798? Ireland was in nearly a similar position to us as Poland to Russia; there was the same ground to sweep away and destroy the Parliament of Ireland as there was to abrogate the Constitution of Poland. When that rebellion, however, was put down, the law and the Constitution were not changed—such, also, was the conduct of this country in the two rebellions in Scotland. The rights of the Irish nation were not forfeited by the Rebellion of 1798, nor were the rights of Scotland affected by what was done in support of the Pretender in 1745. Yet, his was more than a common insurrection—that Prince having the affections of a large portion of the Scottish nation, and having been proclaimed King in the capital of Scotland; he opposed and defeated the King's troops, and marched into the heart of this kingdom, and the King shook on his throne; yet, when that insurrection was put down, though the chief actors in it were punished, Scotland herself was not held to have forfeited her national rights. It did not appear to him that there was a difference between an insurrection in one country or another. He asserted, then, that, even if there was nothing to justify the conduct of the Poles in this insurrection, there was nothing to justify the stripping the nation of its rights. The Constitution was guaranteed by those who signed the Treaty of Vienna. In the letter already referred to, dated April, 1815, and directed to Count Ostrouski, the President of the Senate, the Emperor Alexander promised that, although the kingdom of Poland was to be united to the empire of Russia, it was to be so united by the title of its own Constitution, on which he said he was desirous of founding the happiness of the country. Again, in a proclamation, dated May, 1815, Alexander promised to give the Poles 'A Constitution 'adapted to your wants and localities, and 'your character; the use of your language 'preserved in public acts; public functions, 'and employments conferred on Poles 'only; liberty of commerce and naviga'tion, the facility of communication with 'the parts of ancient Poland which remain 'under another power; your national 'army; all means guaranteed for improv'ing your laws; the free circulation of 'knowledge in your country: such are 'the advantages which you will enjoy 'under our dominion and that of our suc'cessors, and which you will transmit as a 'patriotic inheritance to your descendants.' None of these promises had been observed —what, then, was to be done? There was not one power a party to the Treaty of Vienna but was bound, including France and England, to protect the Poles. He knew that such a feeling existed in the breasts of the French people, whatever might be the opinion of other nations. The declaration, also, of the French Government should be recollected. He was prepared to contend, that that Government could not, after its conduct, permit Poland to be blotted from the nations of Europe. This country was called upon, equally with France, to see that the stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna were fulfilled. Had, however, anything been done? He did not call upon the Government to go to war with Russia; but there was much that might be done. With regard to the performance of the stipulations in a treaty by a rigorous remonstrance, much might be done by measures short of resorting to war. It was by a measure of this sort that the triumphant course of the Russians was stopped in their march to Constantinople. He trusted that England and France would join in remonstrance on this occasion, and that they would act in union for the preservation of the liberties of Europe. Nothing was more alarming in the state of Europe than the great increase and concentration of the power of Russia. At the period of the Treaty of Vienna, the power of Russia was much less than it was now. That Power had made immense strides on the side of Turkey and Persia, and now, by the destruction of Poland and the annexation of that kingdom to the empire of Russia, had prepared for an increase of her power on the western frontier. Unless care was taken in time, the Western States of Europe would have everything to fear from the aggrandizement of Russia, and in such a case we should have only to trust to her moderation. He remembered the time when the encroachments of Russia were looked upon with alarm. He recollected the armament that was prepared, in consequence of the taking of Oczacow—a place now, and even then, of the most trifling importance. If there was one circumstance more formidable than another in the present aspect of affairs, it was the species of terror which seemed to pervade the powers of Europe with respect to the strength of Russia, and the fact, that while they appeared to dread a war with Russia, that power, on all occasions, declared its readiness to go to war; and that readiness it would always manifest, unless it was one day taught that that course of dealing with the civilized powers must no longer continue without interruption. He was convinced that the views of Russia never would be moderated, until a different policy was pursued. Nothing was so calculated to sacrifice the interests of England, and of the Continent, as yielding to a fear of the power of Russia. He did not say that we had yet arrived at that point; but we were fast verging to it, but he hoped we were not yet got so far that Poland was to be allowed to perish under the influence of that terror. What did the King of the French express in his speech of the 23rd of July, 1830, on this subject? Let the House recollect the remarkable words that were then used—that the nationality of Poland shall not perish! But, if this manifesto of Russia was allowed to be enforced, it had perished already, contrary to his hopes and that declaration. At present, according to the *dictum* of the autocrat, the Poles—of whom it might be said, as of one of Napoleon's great captains, that, as a nation they were brave among the brave—were no longer to have an existence as a nation. Whatever might have been the conduct of the different governments, there was no feeling in the human heart throughout Europe that was not awakened in favour of that unfortunate and gallant people. They had with them the sympathy of all men—they deserved the use of power for their preservation. In the Speech of the king of France I find the memorable words: 'Une lutte 'sanglante et acharnée se prolonge en 'Pologne. Cette lutte entretient de vives 'émotions au sein de l'Europe. Je me 'suis pressé d'en hâter le terme. Après 'avoir offert ma médiation, j'ai provoqué 'celle des grandes Puissances; j'ai tenté 'arrêter l'effusion du sang; préserver le 'midi de l'Europe du fléau de la contagion que la guerre propage, et surtout 'assurer à la Pologne, dont le courage a reveillé les vieilles affections de 'la France, cette nationalité qui résiste au 'tems et à ses vicissitudes.' Such was the language used by Louis Phillippe. The Polish nation relied on the promises then given, for they recollected that their best blood had been liberally poured out in fighting the battles of France. It was only the selfish policy of Napoleon, in whose service they had performed prodigies of valour, that prevented their becoming an independent state, and in obtaining that rank among the nations of Europe to which they were entitled. Napoleon gave them a Grand Duke who was a Saxon: he ought to have given them a king, who was a Pole. Those brave and unfortunate men, who left their homes to fight his battles, were faithful to him, notwithstanding, to the last, and they perished in his cause on the banks of the Beresina. The language of the king of France, to which he had alluded, was re-echoed by the Chamber of Deputies, on the address presented in answer to the speech from the throne. He said, "In the touching language of your majesty respecting the independence of Poland, the Chamber of Deputies rejoices to hear the assurance which is dear to it, that the nationality of Poland shall not perish." He was sure every liberal-minded man in Europe rejoiced at that declaration. The Chamber of Deputies from that hour was pledged to the nationality of Poland. He had reason to know that there was an intense feeling in France in favour of Poland, and the people of France were almost as anxious for the independence of that nation as they were for their own. It had been stated, that, an intimation was given to the Polish generals that if they delayed attacking the Russian army for two months, their security should be guaranteed. The Polish general did delay—that fatal delay—and Poland was ruined. Poland was subdued, it had been said, not by the arms of Russia, but by the promises of other powers. England, he hoped and believed, had not this delusion to answer for. France had been directly charged with it, but whether justly or not she had given pledges in favour of the cause of Poland, which it would be disgraceful in her not to redeem. Her king, her ministers, the legislature in both its branches, were pledged to the nationality of Poland. Nay, her ministers had pledged themselves further, they had pledged themselves to the recognition of Polish nationality by Russia herself. It would be recollected that General Sebastiani, the Secretary for foreign affairs in France, on the 19th of September last, stated to the Chamber of Deputies, that the French government, after the battle of Ostralimked, found at St. Petersburgh a Cabinet irritated against Poland, but that it made Russia to understand that there were two questions—one domestic and personal to Russia, and the other European—that the French government added, that the stipulations at the Congress of Vienna had created a kingdom, and that that kingdom of European creation, ought to continue to exist. The French foreign secretary then went on to state that explanations had been demanded—that they were clear and precise—that, assurances of the conservation of Poland had been given to all the great Powers, for that all of them had united themselves to France. He added, that the assurance expressed to the Chamber—that the nationality of Poland, of that heroic people, would be preserved to them—was founded on the formal and reiterated promises of the emperor of Russia to that effect. He would now allude to the language of M. Casimir Perier—that powerful and able minister, who seemed to have that decision and energy of character which were suited to the times, and who appeared also to have in view the true interests of his country, and in nothing more than in cultivating, as he did, a good understanding with England. That minister, on the 7th of March, 1832, made a speech in the Chamber of Deputies, in which he declared, that Poland had not lost the rights she had acquired by treaties, yet, upon the 26th of the preceding February, the manifesto to which he was now directing the attention of the House was issued. There could not have been sufficient time between the 26th of February and the 7th of March for this document to reach the French capital. When it reached the hands of the minister, it must have occasioned to him no small surprise, and perhaps embarrassment, after the assurances which the French government had received and given, that the nationality of Poland should be preserved. The president of the council, in the speech to which I am now referring, says—'One 'political question only arises out of 'these events—that of the nullity of Po'land: it is the question of the mainte'nance of treaties; and France does not 'abandon her on those points more than 'she has disavowed her upon others. 'By the result of these events, Poland 'is still subject to a provisional *regime*, but 'she has not lost the rights which she 'holds under treaties. These rights are 'not contended by the Court of Russia, 'and already Europe has the assurance 'that the basis laid by the treaty will be 'respected.' This was at once a proof that guarantees had been given to France on the subject. This was a distinct declaration of the prime minister of France, that the independence of Poland was to be preserved; but at the time he made his speech, the manifesto was in existence, and by it the rights which had been secured to Poland by treaties were to be destroyed, and the nationality and independence of that kingdom to be for ever extinguished. By the manifesto of the emperor, it was stated that, by the statute of organization a new form and order of things was to be introduced into Poland, which was for ever to form an integral part of the kingdom of Poland, or become a Russian province—the king of Poland is to be crowned at Moscow—the making of laws and the raising of taxes is definitively to rest with the Council of State of Russia—every bulwark of Polish liberty and independence is overthrown. The Polish Diets, instead of being the free legislative assemblies of that country, were to be no more than so many county meetings of the chief men of the district—not to examine and redress evils, and to make the laws that are to govern their country, but merely to report to the Russian authorities the state of Poland. By this manifesto, too, Poland was no longer to have a national army. Before the Poles would have consented to such a condition, they would have shed the last drop of their blood. But they were now powerless, and this condition was imposed upon them. The emperor promised to his Polish subjects, by his manifesto, personal liberty and freedom of worship, but where was the security for either? The Roman Catholic religion was, indeed, placed, by the statute of organization under the special protection of government. What protection the religion of Poland, the Roman Catholic, was to expect, might be collected from the contents of an ukase, dated so late as the 5th of November last, and which was as follows:—'Having learnt, from the Eparch 'Paul, bishop of Meastan, that the Lieu'tenant Kolinski has built, in his district, 'a Roman Catholic church which may be'come prejudicial to the believers of our 'holy Greek religion—having been inform'ed that several Roman Catholic churches 'and chapels have been built in the pro'vince of Padolia, which is contrary to the 'Ukase of the 19th of October, 1831—we 'ordain that, henceforward, the eccle'siastical authority shall not name any 'more curates for the churches, or permit 'any priest, not domiciliated in those places 'to perform divine service; and, as it has 'come to our knowledge that the funds 'that have been appropriated to the keep'ing up of the church of Kretinia had been 'registered in the books of the same dis'tricts, we enjoin that the same be struck 'off, and that no act of the kind be in 'future admitted in the register. A single 'Catholic priest ought to visit, fromtime to 'time, all those churches, and to celebrate 'divine service, particularly in the time of 'Lent. The same regulation extends to the 'Roman Catholic church, Maskowsa, built 'by the Lieutenant Maskowsa, as to all 'others which may be discovered.' Such was the regard of the emperor Nicholas for religious liberty—such was the special protection afforded by him to the Roman Catholic religion—the national religion of his Polish subjects. Much had been said of the moderation and clemency of the emperor Nicholas. He wished he could doubt the authenticity of a document, to which he was now about to call the attention of the House. Its authenticity, however, could not, he feared, be questioned. It was the copy of a letter printed in the *Courier de Wilne*, of the 3rd of December, 1831, and professing to be from his Majesty, the emperor of all the Russias, to the governor general of Wilna. That Sovereign writes to this officer as follows:—'It is with great pain 'that I learn, from the report of the chief 'of my staff, that the tranquillity of the 'government committed to your care is 'still troubled by the excursions of the 'banditti, the remains of the rebel armies, 'who, concealing themselves in the forest, 'and infesting the high roads, commit all 'sorts of crimes. In approving of the 'energetic measures which you have taken 'to exterminate them, particularly your 'proclamation to the inhabitants of the government, in which you give them notice 'of the most severe punishments to which 'every person would expose himself by 'affording them an asylum; in everything 'I authorize you to act against those 'brigands as if, for a second time, they 'had become guilty of a revolt, wishing, by prompt and severe measures, to 'prevent others from joining the guilty. 'We order you not to be stopped by the 'formalities of the criminal law, but to 'proceed against them according to the rules 'of courts-martial; and if you should find 'that their execution is stopped by the 'forms of the tribunals, and if, in your 'opinion, you find them guilty, you will 'make them forthwith suffer the pain of 'death in the place where they shall have 'been arrested, or on the spot where the 'crime shall have been committed.' He would not attempt, for it was unnecessary, to excite the indignation of the House, at this dreadful death-warrant issued by a sovereign of Europe against his subjects. Whilst the mildness and mercy of the emperor Nicholas were the theme of some persons' praise, he had transported his Polish subjects by thousands from their own country to the barren wilds of Siberia. Poles of the highest rank and character were consigned to the Russian prisons, to pass the remainder of their lives in the most abject state of misery. The brave soldiers of Poland, and the high and patriotic nobles of that land were treated in the most degrading manner. Their children were sent to the military colonies, where they were to be brought up and educated with the serfs of Russia. Numbers of the Polish soldiers—some even of the officers of the Polish army, had been marched on foot with their heads shaven to Tobolsk and Irkubol. This was to be the punishment of all who took part in the war. The engagements that were entered into with these unhappy men had been violated, and they were hurried away by thousands to Siberia, instead of being allowed to return to their houses. He willingly turned away from the heart-rending subject, and would now put it to the Government of the country, whether something might not still be done for Poland? He contended that England, as well as France was called upon to interfere, and that it was not yet too late; and they would be justified in interfering by the conduct of Russia itself. Greece had been in the possession of the Turks for 300 years, when Russia united with France and England to secure the independence of insurgent Greece. Again the possession of Belgium was guaranteed to the king of Holland, yet with the other powers of Europe we interfered, and Belgium was declared independent of Holland. In the first instance, the powers of Europe interfered without the obligation of any treaty; and, in the second, against the obligation of a treaty. Was Poland, then, which had justice and the obligation of the most solemn treaty in her favour, to be treated on a different principle. Nothing could prevent the other governments of Europe from interfering, if it was not the dread of the power of Russia; and he would say, that unless some check was imposed to the grasping ambition of Russia, she would go on adding to her empire, for which purpose she never neglected any opportunity nor lacked a pretext, and would soon make the nations of Europe feel, that, in neglecting to check her, they had neglected the means of securing their own safety. The whole policy of Russia, for the last fifty or eighty years, had been her own aggrandizement, and this had been steadily and successfully pursued. Her policy had been that of the Roman empire, and her ambition, like that of the Romans, knew no bounds. Russia, above all powers that now existed should be an object of watchful jealousy. He admitted that this country was much indebted to his Majesty's Government for the exertions they had used to preserve peace, and he was sure in what he had now said, he had not urged them to abandon a policy, which they had hitherto conducted so successfully. In spite of difficulties they had preserved peace, which was of great consequence. At the same time, he trusted they would never suffer the national honour to be tarnished. The manifesto, the act of the emperor of Russia, was in direct opposition to the stipulation of a treaty, to which Great Britain was a party, and to the observance of which her faith was pledged. Not to feel for the treatment of Poland by Russia, a man must be lost to every sense of honour and justice, and be utterly indifferent to the welfare of his fellow men. Her truest and best citizens had been sacrificed, the most solemn compacts violated, thousands of her people had been sent to perish in the wilds of Siberia, and Poland would cease to exist unless the powers of Europe interfered at once in her behalf. He believed a feeling in favour of that country pervaded all ranks and classes of men, and he trusted the Government would see the necessity of uniting with the other European Powers to rescue that unhappy nation from the iron grasp of its oppressors. He would conclude by calling the attention of the House and the Government to the fate of these illustrious men, the flower of the nobility of Poland, many of whom would perish in dungeons, and others were wandering as exiles over the face of the earth, some of them had been in the councils of the emperor Alexander, and had advised him faithfully. Would to God he had profited by their sentiments, it would have been much better for Poland, for Russia, and the world. He had now only to thank the House for the indulgence with which it had listened to him. He would not move an amendment on the Motion of the noble Lord, but would, by a separate motion hereafter ask for the production of a copy of the manifesto of the emperor Nicholas of the 26th of January, and of the statute of organization to which it referred.

Lord *Althorp* said, before he made any remarks on the subject of his hon. friend's address, he must apologize for the absence of his noble friend, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who was unavoidably kept away by very important business; it, therefore, devolved upon him to say the few words that might be expected to come from some Member of his Majesty's Government upon an occasion such as that, when a most important subject had been brought under the notice of the House with so much ability by his hon. friend. They had as yet received no official information of the occurrences which had recently taken place in Poland; and, for that, as well as for other reasons, it was not to be expected that he should at that moment enter into any explanation relating to the views entertained by his Majesty's Government with respect to this most interesting and important question; and he, therefore, hoped that the House would excuse his entering into any details whatever. At the same time it was impossible for him even to touch upon such a subject without expressing the profound sympathy which the sufferings of the unhappy Poles must excite in the breast of every man of common humanity; in that sympathy he trusted the House would do his colleagues and himself the justice to believe that they fully participated. Beyond that it was impossible for him at the present moment to go, unless he were merely allowed to observe, that the Government of this country had at no time held out any encouragement whatever, tending to incite the Polish nation to the late contest, which ended so fatally for their interests. He regretted that it was not in his power to say more upon the subject, that a sense of duty compelled him to be silent; but he hoped that the brevity of his remarks would not be construed into any indifference to the condition of Poland.

Sir *George Warrender* was anxious to record his opinion upon this interesting and important question: he fully agreed with the remarks made by his hon. and learned friend, and with the sympathy he expressed for the state to which Poland was reduced. He had the happiness of knowing some of the illustrious men who were now exiles from their native country; and he believed more enlightened patriots or more disinterested persons, did not exist; but the question went far beyond any influence of private feeling; it was most intimately connected with the best interests of every independent state in Europe. However anxious he was, still to preserve peace, he trusted there was yet so much feeling in the House of Commons as to echo the general sentiments of the country, which was so loudly expressed in behalf of the oppressed Poles, so as to induce the Government to make the strongest remonstrances in behalf of that nation, connected as we were with their cause, from having become a party to the treaties which guaranteed the independence of Poland, we could not abandon them, or suffer the conditions of the treaty to be evaded, if we had any regard to the maintenance of the national honour.

Mr. *Labouchere* said, it was impossible for any man, possessed of the common feelings of humanity, not to be indignant at the shameless and arrogant conduct of Russia with regard to Poland. The treatment that oppressed country had sustained at the hands of the Russian autocrat, besides its cruelty, was the most alarming circumstance which had occurred since the Treaty of Vienna to disturb the peace of Europe, as it had a manifest tendency to extend the already overgrown power of Russia. If the sovereign of that country, merely by a stroke of his pen, could erase Poland from the list of independent nations, he would not stop there with his aggressions, and Poland would only form the basis for more extended operations. It, therefore, became the duty of every other state to check his career, by the most urgent remonstrances, at least, and upon no occasion could they have a better cause, or a more favourable opportunity, for an universal sympathy prevailed throughout Europe for the fate of Poland; and it was impossible those feelings could be allayed until this most unjust and violent act had been repaired. There could be no doubt that Russia had become a party to the restoration of independence to Poland by the Treaty of Vienna; but, if any further proof of that fact was wanted, it would be found in the following speech of the Emperor Alexander, to the Polish diet, in 1818. He said, "Your restoration is defended by solemn treaties; it is sanctioned by the constitutional charter. The immutability of these external engagements, and of the fundamental law, assures henceforward to Poland an honourable rank among the nations of Europe." He felt that it was dangerous to speak of the perfidy of sovereigns, but he could not forget, that the Emperor of Russia, engaged by oath to maintain the constitution of Poland, and his hon. friend had clearly shewn that every article of the constitution had been broken. There was one point in particular in which the nationality of the Poles was infringed, and upon which they felt extremely sensitive. According to one of the articles of the constitution, no Russian soldiers were to be in the country, unless with the consent of the Diet. Notwithstanding this, however, not less than 10,000 soldiers, were garrisoned at Warsaw, and Russian officers were appointed to every place of trust in the kingdom. The liberty of the Press, which was guaranteed, was most shamefully violated, and the most strict censorship was instituted. Personal liberty was constantly sacrificed, and persons were committed to prison, or sent to the distant provinces of Russia, from whence they never could return, on the most trifling pretences. Indeed, the insults the Poles had to put up with were of such a description that human nature could not bear them. They were goaded to resistance, and he only regretted, from the result, that the Poles had somewhat prematurely made the attempt to free themselves from the yoke of the despot. He would conclude by expressing his satisfaction at the few words which fell from his noble friend, and to express his hope that Government would not lose sight of this subject; until redress was obtained for Poland, there could be no security for the preservation of the peace of Europe.

Dr. *Lushington* said, his hon. and learned friend, who had brought the question forward, had put it in such a clear light, that little remained for others to do than to express their hearty concurrence in the observations made by him. He felt it, however, necessary to allude to one or two of the topics touched upon by his hon. and learned friend, with a view to urge them more closely upon the attention of the House. In his opinion, it was of the utmost importance that the British Government should never interfere with the affairs of foreign nations, unless they were clearly justified by the law of nations, and bound by treaties. The present was certainly a case in which both were bound by treaty, and justified by the laws of nations to interfere, at least, so far as to make it absolutely necessary for the British Government to make a solemn protest against the conduct of Russia. He was sure no man could regard the recent conduct of the sovereign of Russia towards Poland, without entertaining feelings of abhorrence at his cruelty. By the Treaty of Vienna, the independence of Poland was guaranteed, and Great Britain had a right to interfere, as she was a party to the pacification of Europe in 1815. Russia was bound to adhere to the treaty which guaranteed the independence of Poland; but what had been her conduct? Every article of the constitution of that country had been violated and destroyed, at the caprice of an arbitrary and furious despot, and the most patriotic men had been subjected to the most violent and tyrannical punishments, in violation of all law. The nation was exasperated; it was impossible for human nature to bear such treatment, and they endeavoured to throw off the chains which bound them. The people took up arms against the oppressor; and, from the patriotism and courage they displayed, he regretted with no better success, for they were fully entitled to rank among free and independent states. Their exertions to achieve independence surpassed all praise; and their patriotism—that virtue which excelled all others, and which, as Cicero says, "Quo omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est"—had not been excelled at any time by any people. They were prepared to sacrifice all for their country, and it was only through treachery that they did not succeed in their attempt. He said, that, both by the law of God, and the law of nations, they were justified in their insurrection—would to God they had been successful! Although we might acquiesce in the result, we were bound to soften the bitterness of their sufferings. Under these circumstances the Government was justified in calling upon Russia to desist from the present course of her policy. It ought to say, "You must not make an increase to your territory in consequence of conduct which you occasioned. You must not make your own crimes a pretence for your own aggrandizement. We call upon you to fulfil the Treaty of Vienna; we call upon you to perform those engagements you entered into with us; we call upon you to act in accordance with every principle of the law of nations; we call upon you, in the name of justice and honour, not to sacrifice those solemn pledges you gave to the people of Poland. This is not merely a case of humanity, but a due regard for the national honour compels us to interfere." He saw no reason why the nations of Europe should not unite in the strongest remonstrances on this breach of faith. And, above all, he thought that France and Great Britain should, by a solemn record of their opinions, denounce to future times their opinion of those transactions; for he was persuaded there could be but one opinion in both countries as to the atrocity of the transactions. They ought to declare to the Emperor of Russia, that the two most enlightened nations of Europe felt themselves bound to express their detestation of the cruelty that had been used, and to record their utter abhorrence of such conduct.

Lord Viscount *Sandon* rose to express what he was sure was the common feeling of every man and every party in this country—a full concurrence in the sentiments which had been expressed on both sides of the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke last, expressed his confidence that England and France would join together in remonstrance against the atrocious act of destroying the independence of Poland. However that might be, he thought it highly desirable at least that a marked expression of public feeling should emanate from that House upon this subject. Russia ought to be made to know that her conduct towards a heroic but unfortunate nation excited the greatest indignation throughout the whole British empire; and he also hoped that might induce other nations to follow her example in reprobating this outrage upon national independence.—Those powers, indeed, who were parties with us in the solemn compact which united Poland to the crown of Russia, ought to make a general remonstrance against this infraction of the fundamental conditions of that union, and should express individually their opinion upon the unblushing manner in which Russia had recently violated that treaty. He could not bring himself to believe that such a protest would pass unheeded, as public opinion was gaining every day a more powerful influence over the policy of nations. Above all other things, however, he must condemn the deportation of the Poles to Siberia as an act of unparalleled atrocity, and the destruction of the nationality of Poland, as an act of unexampled insolence to the other powers of Europe. He was sorry to use such language towards one of the leading powers of Europe; but justice would not allow him to use more measured language; and he knew that, in thus denouncing the conduct of Russia, he was only speaking the sentiments of his numerous and intelligent constituents.

Mr. *Courtenay* said, that if he did not preface his observations with expressions of sympathy with the Poles, and admiration of the conduct of their heroic leaders, it was because he was unable to clothe his sentiments in language equal to that which had already been addressed to the House. He was anxious, however, to say a few words to guard the Poles against being led to form any delusive hopes, such as they had before formed, much to their own injury. He accused not the Government of exciting those hopes, but he thought the proposition of his hon. and learned friend for an address to his Majesty might have that effect. He certainly never would concur in any such address, unless it were to be followed up by a declaration, on the part of the House, that it was ready to obtain the object for which it addressed the Crown by employing the whole strength and force of the country. He was not prepared to do that, but he had learned from Mr. Canning never to put forth a threat which he was not prepared to carry into execution. Mr. Canning, in his defence of the policy which he pursued towards Spain during the last invasion of that country by the French armies, expressly said, that we ought not to make a powerful remonstrance against the proceedings of another nation, unless we were prepared, if the remonstrance was unsuccessful, to follow it up by war. The Poles, to whom the debate of that night would be known, would form expectations of receiving assistance which must be unfounded, for he was sure that the nation, however much it might sympathise with unfortunate Poland, was not disposed to go to war to restore its nationality. He hoped that Ministers would be prepared, at an early day after the recess, to state, not only what they had done, but also what they intended to do, with regard to Poland. Till that time came, he should abstain from giving any opinion. By the first article of the Treaty of Vienna, it was provided, that Poland should have a national existence. That article was inserted at the particular recommendation of our Minister (Lord Castlereagh), which increased the interest he took in the debate. It appeared, therefore, that the late decree of the emperor Nicholas, destroying the national existence of Poland, was a contravention of the Treaty of Vienna, and Ministers ought to state, when they had official cognizance of the proceeding, whether they were prepared to acquiesce in that contravention of the treaty or not. He begged to be understood as not asserting that the article referred to guaranteed to Poland a free constitution: unless, as the hon. member for Taunton had inferred, a national existence could not well be preserved without a free and independent government; but Lord Castlereagh had neither asked nor given any such guaranty. He looked only, as he (Mr. Courtenay) would always contend he was right in looking, to the interests of England. The Government might not be prepared to enforce the Treaty of Vienna, and that was a point upon which the House ought to be informed. Certainly, in conformity with the policy which had been pursued with respect to Belgium, there might, perhaps, be reasons for not insisting on the strict execution of the Treaty of Vienna regarding Poland, especially as fifteen years had elapsed since the signature of that treaty. He should have entered further into a discussion on the principle of interference, and our conduct in other parts of the world, had his noble friend, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, been present; but, in the absence of his noble friend, he should think it right to withhold his observations.

Sir *Francis Vincent* said, that the Poles who had fought under the walls of Warsaw were not less worthy of admiration than the Poles who had driven the infidels from the walls of Vienna. He thought that Europe, in the nineteenth century was not less indebted to them than it was in the seventeenth century, for the heroic valour with which they had struggled against the common enemy of all its free states and liberal institutions. The parties to the Treaty of Vienna would compromise their honour beyond all powers of redemption if they did not insist upon the maintenance of the nationality of Poland. The present was, in his opinion, a fit time for standing up against the colossal power of Russia, for we were now secure of the co-operation of France, and of all the friends of liberty in Europe. Let Russia beware lest Europe should determine to atone for its participation in the crime of partitioning Poland, by restoring it once more to a national existence.

Mr. *Hume* could not allow the present discussion to pass without expressing his gratitude to his hon. and learned friend for the statement which he had made. For his part, he thought that, as the Treaty of Vienna was the first in which England recognized the partition of Poland, the engagements into which we then entered compelled us to use every means in our power by way of remonstrance, to vindicate the limited nationality of Poland. Previously to their last noble struggle for national freedom and independence the Poles had endured grievances, until it became a sacred duty to resist the infliction of them. The world knew well the part which the French government had played in these transactions; but it knew nothing of the part which had been played by the British Government. He had received numberless applications from his constituents to demand some information on that point from his Majesty's Ministers, and he thought that the time was now at length come in which the country must have a statement from those Ministers, explaining whether they had fulfilled their duty in a manner worthy of the character of this country as an European power. He thought that we should have no occasion to proceed to hostilities in vindication of the nationality of Poland. There was a great difference between making a remonstrance and entering into hostilities—and he was decidedly convinced that the expression of a strong opinion by the Powers of Europe would preclude the necessity of going to war. There was an unanimity of opinion among his constituents on the subject of Poland which he had never witnessed on any other subject. He was sure that they would be most anxious to assist the Government in any measures which it might take to relieve the misfortunes of Poland. He augured from the speech of the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), that the country would have no reason to complain of the policy pursued by Government on this most interesting question.

Sir *Charles Forbes* sympathised as deeply as any Member in the House with the misfortunes of the brave and unfortunate Poles. He always wished them success, and he was only surprised that they had let that monster Constantine escape, instead of hanging him up, as they would have been justified in doing, to the highest pinnacle in Warsaw. He lamented that the interference of this country, if made at all, would now be too late to be of the slightest advantage to Poland.

Colonel *Fox* said, that he fully agreed with every sentiment which had been so ably expressed on this subject by the hon. and learned member for Kirkcudbright. He could affirm that the recent treatment of the Poles by Russia had excited in all parts of Germany as much indignation as it had in either Great Britain or France; and he must further express a hope that the people of that country would be found ready to assist the other civilized states of Europe in atoning for the crime of partitioning Poland, in which they had all participated.

Mr. *Ewart* concurred with the hon. and gallant Officer in thinking that, if we remonstrated against the recent proceedings of Russia, we should have the sincere and cordial co-operation of the people of Germany; but, he was also fully persuaded that we ought not to make any remonstrance against the proceedings of Russia which we were not prepared to follow up by vigorous measures. He called upon the House to consider whether France would not gladly join us in any remonstrance which we might make against the unjust oppression which Russia was now exercising over Poland. He was convinced that if Ministers would only take a strong and decided part in vindication not only of the rights of Poland, but he might also add the liberties of Europe, they would be supported by the unanimous approbation of every man who deserved the name in Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. *Sheil* said, that the hon. and learned civilian had expressed a conviction that there existed but one feeling through Great Britain with respect to the wrongs of Poland, and had added, that he believed that it extended to the sister island. He could assure him that it did. It were strange if Ireland should not sympathize with national misfortune. He considered that this discussion had been attended with a useful result. The eloquence of the Gentleman who had brought it forward was not only the medium by which his own unaffected feelings were expressed, but he had given utterance to the emotions of the entire country. He had not opened a new source of national sensibility, but had unlocked a fountain which had remained too long sealed. The hon. Gentleman had the merit of calling up the Representative of his Majesty's Government, who had proved that the principles and feelings of Lord Althorp were not merged in the official formalities and precautions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The eye and the intonations of the noble Lord supplied any want of distinct declaration that Poland should not be allowed to perish. An hon. Gentleman had said, that it was little consolation to the exiles from Poland to receive this late and valueless sympathy. True it was, that the pains of exile were almost irremediable, but yet it must be to those gallant and illustrious men a source of mournful satisfaction to know, that while England blushed at her having permitted Poland to fall, her blushes were mingled with her tears. This subject had been so amply treated, the case was so clearly established, that he should avoid reiterating what had been already so perspicuously expressed. It had been proved that the Treaty of Vienna had been violated, that the wrongs of Poland had been unendurable, and that her resistance to oppression was not matter of choice, but of absolute and unavoidable necessity. "Gallant, chivalrous, high-minded people—nation of heroes," exclaimed the hon. and learned Gentleman "you are fallen; but your disasters are encompassed with a glory so surpassing, that the most splendid and successful achievements of ancient or modern times fade and grow dim before it." And shall nothing be done to save the remnant of that illustrious race, and will England, France Europe, stand by and permit this outrage on all law, on all justice, on all honour, on all humanity? No; the cause of Poland is that of the world, against whose interests, against whose civilization, against whose liberties, the great autocrat of the north will aim a deadly blow, if this flagitious proceeding be allowed to pass with impunity, and converted into a precedent for unlimited aggression. Let it not be imagined that France and England, if they stand together, will plead for Poland without avail. But, if we shall be slow to appeal to arms for Poland, there is a duty which no prudential regards ought to induce us to delay. France has given the example. She has given to the illustrious exiles from that glorious and yet unhappy country a noble national welcome. The coffers of the state have been thrown open. Let England imitate her generosity, or rather let England look to her own conduct in other instances as a model; and as to the refugees of Spain and Portugal, she gave a prompt and honourable succour, let her with a hand of hospitable liberality lift those men from destitution, who may seek a shelter on her shores, and prove that while England shall last liberty shall never want a home.

Mr. *Hunt* had reason to believe that, if theBritish Government had not held back, France would have afforded assistance to the Poles at a period when assistance was useful. He regretted that the Motion had not been brought forward at an earlier period. The Poles were misled by the public Press of this and other countries, which urged them on to resistance. He believed the Government itself had not misled the Poles, but they allowed the public Press to mislead them, and the same observation was applicable to the government of France.

The question that the House, on its rising, adjourn to the 7th of May, carried.

ANATOMY BILL.] On the Motion of Mr. Warburton, the House resolved itself into a Committee on this Bill. On the clause being read which authorizes parties having the lawful custody of bodies to dispose of them for the purpose of dissection, unless the deceased shall have expressed a desire to the contrary, either in writing or verbally before two witnesses,

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, that he objected both to the gift and to the sale of bodies for dissection. He should, therefore, propose that there be added to this clause a proviso, prohibiting all governors of hospitals or infirmaries, and all governors of gaols, having the legal custody of persons deceased from allowing such bodies to be dissected. He had no wish to exclude from anatomical examination such bodies as died of diseases of rare occurrence, but his object was, to prevent an abuse, which under the colour of a plea of that kind, might be made to extend to other cases.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he must oppose the Amendment, for to make any regulations to prevent the dissection of persons who died in hospitals would do the greatest mischief to the practice of surgery, for hospitals were the great schools of surgery; and the Amendment would go to deprive students and surgeons of some of the best opportunities of learning their profession which they now enjoyed. With respect to the other point in the Amendment, it was admitted, that the principle of the law ought to apply to the rich and poor alike; he did not see upon what ground the latter must be excluded from the operation of this Bill, as far as those who died in workhouses were concerned.

Mr. *Robinson* had objected to this clause on a former occasion; and as this was the last opportunity he should have, he would now restate his objections to it. Both the hon. member for Bridport and the right hon. member for Tamworth, on a former occasion assumed, in their arguments, that if this clause was negatived, there were no other means left to the student for pursuing the study of anatomical science. He denied that proposition; and also, that those who had felt it their duty to oppose this Bill in some of its clauses, were actuated by a desire to throw any impediment in the way of that science. For his own part, he felt a most sincere anxiety to promote a science necessary to the welfare of the human species; but he differed from the hon. Member as to the mode of attaining that object. The terms in which this clause was drawn up seemed chosen with a view to conceal the disgusting process it was to facilitate. "Subject bodies to anatomical examination" meant nothing more or less than holding out an inducement to the most poor and miserable class of the community to dispose, by public sale, of the dead bodies of their nearest relatives. A husband, for instance, might sell the body of his wife, the mother of his children; and there would be found persons to urge him to such an unnatural action for the sake of profit—for this Bill would create a set of people who would act as brokers for the procuring of subjects, and ready to take all advantages. His belief was, that, if the Legislature had repealed the Act which now consigned the bodies of malefactors to the dissecting room, and had afforded additional facilities in hospitals and other places for anatomical study, the purposes of the present Act would have been accomplished. At any rate he would never be a party to such an enactment. The protection the clause pretended to give to those who wished not to have their bodies dissected after death was perfectly nugatory. How was it to be proved that they expressed this negative wish? Persons moving in the class of life of the hon. member for Bridport, would take care to leave some testimony of their wishes in this respect by will or otherwise; but the poor and ignorant, even if they knew of the provision, would not have the same facilities for expressing such a wish. Instead of requiring a negative to prevent dissection, an affirmative should be required to permit it He announced an amendment, the other night to that effect; but was outvoted, and he supposed the same would occur again; he would, therefore, content himself with protesting against the whole measure. Seeing it was perfectly useless, he would not give himself the trouble of further opposing it.

Mr. *Wason* said, the simple question before the House was, whether they would allow human bodies to be regularly bought and sold: on such an occasion the feelings of the people ought to be consulted, and, with that view, he had gone through all the petitions that had been presented to the House on this subject; and he found that there were only two in favour of the Bill, and either seventeen or eighteen against some of the main features of it. It was, therefore, a mistake to say, that the Bill was popular in the country. Even the London College of Medicine had prayed the House to prevent the purchase and sale of bodies, on account of the feelings of the people being opposed to such a provision. He believed the unclaimed bodies in work houses and hospitals would be found sufficient for the purpose of anatomical science. Last year he understood these amounted to upwards of 260, and these might be had without outraging any person's feelings; but then, it was said, to take these for such purposes would hold out one law for the poor and another for the rich, by subjecting the bodies of the former only to dissection. By making it legal for any person to sell their bodies, it was said all were placed on an equality, as if the rich man would sell his body or that of his relatives. The operation of the clause, it was clear, would be confined to the bodies of the poor.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that if the Amendment of the hon. member for Oxford was carried, he should move, what he had always threatened to move—that the bodies of all placemen and pensioners should be given up for dissection.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, the circumstances of the relatives being relieved from the expenses of the burying their friends might operate as an inducement to some persons to give up the bodies for the purposes of anatomical science, as the schools of medicine, who obtained them, were bound to bury them, but he objected to making a general provision to legalize the sale. In one year, upwards of 5,000 bodies were buried at the expense of the parishes; part of these might have been for the purpose of dissection.

Mr. *Briscoe* had every desire to respect the welfare and advantage of the public; but he did not see that any benefit to the country would arise from such a very indefinite clause as this, under which the bodies of the whole population of the United Kingdom, as well as of foreigners in England, might be handed over to the surgeons for dissection.

Mr. *Hunt* observed, that he had presented a Petition from several persons in Lancaster gaol, stating that their allowances had been taken away, that they were unwell, and feared they might die in gaol, when, if this Bill passed, their bodies might be given up for dissection, to which they had great objections. But then, it was said, they might leave directions prohibiting it; but who had the custody of such objections but the gaoler? and who was to have the sale of the bodies but the same person? The clause was, therefore, a mockery, and he would divide the House upon it, even if the Amendment was negatived.

The Committee divided on the Amendment: Ayes 4; Noes 48—Majority 44.

On the question that the Clause stand part of the Bill, the Committee again divided: Ayes 46; Noes 6—Majority 40.

On the Clause which provides that the body of the deceased shall be kept twenty-four hours previous to its being handed over for dissection,

Mr. *Briscoe* said, it would be utterly impossible, in many cases, to communicate with the relatives of the deceased in so short a period as twenty-four hours. He moved that forty-eight hours be substituted.

Mr. *Hume* said, it was quite obvious that, in many cases, it was necessary bodies should be dissected as soon as possible after death, but he would not resist the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. *Hunt* proposed that these words be inserted in the Clause:—" Nor until after the inspector of the district shall have been sent for, and shall have inspected the body of the deceased, and shall have been satisfied of the cause of his or her death, by the signature of his or her surgeon or physician, provided always that such physician or surgeon be in no case whatever interested in the school of anatomy to which the body is to be consigned." His object was, to protect the public, and prevent a repetition of the horrible scenes which had recently occurred.

Mr. *Warburton* thought the provision unnecessary, because, the certificate of a well-known respectable man would be quite sufficient, but he was ready to admit that, in some cases, where the medical man was not known, his certificate would not be sufficient. His great objection to this proposition was, that it interfered with matters which had much better be left to the discretion of the Home Secretary.

The Committee divided on the Amendment: Ayes 1; Noes 49—Majority 48.

Mr. *Briscoe* said, he had some doubts whether a body ought, under any circumstances, to be allowed to be removed until it had been first examined by the Inspector.

Mr. *Warburton* remarked, that he could only repeat what he had before said, that such matters of detail ought to be left to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, he thought there was no occasion for the provision mentioned by the hon. Member; a certificate from a respectable medical man would be sufficient, in his opinion, to authorize the removal of a body.

Mr. *Hunt* said, many persons might die without having the attendance of a medical man, and how was such an one to certify to the illness he did not see?

An *Hon. Member* observed, that surgeons were frequently examined on Coroners' inquests as to the cause of the death of a person whom they had never before seen.

Mr. *Hunt:* No doubt they were; but it was generally the case of some external death produced by violent means; and they were also examined in open Court upon Oath.

Sir *Robert Inglis* moved this Amendment: " That a penalty of 100*l*. should be inflicted on any person proffering a gratuity of any description whatever for a dead body, or receiving such a gratuity."

The division was as follows: Ayes 11; Noes 49; Majority 38.

Mr. Hunt moved the insertion of a clause to require persons taking out licences for dissecting to pay a certain annual sum.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, it was not competent for a Committee to entertain such a provision, because its object was, to impose a tax, and no proposition of that sort could be considered in Committee.

The Committee divided on the Amendment; Ayes 11; Noes 49—Majority 38.

The House subsequently divided on Clause D: Ayes 45; Noes 5—Majority 40.

Clause agreed to.

Mr. *Hunt* proposed an Amendment, the object of which was, to leave to the Judges the power of ordering murderers to be given up for dissection; the Bill proposing to repeal that part of the law.

On this Amendment the Committee divided: Ayes 1; Noes 49—Majority 48.

Clauses agreed to.

Adjourned till May 7th.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, May 7, 1832.

Minutes.] Bills read a second time:—Tithes (Ireland); Friendly Societies Acts Amendment; Barbadoes Provision.

Petitions presented. By the Duke of Gordon, from the County of Ross, against Alteration of the Distillery Laws.—By the Earl of Fingall, from Nobber, for the Abolition of Tythes and Church Cess in Ireland.—By Lord Auckland, from Leith;—by the Duke of Richmond, from Ayr and Peebles;—by the Earl of Radnor, from Kilbirnie, and from other places;—by Earl Grey, from Halifax, and ten other Places;—by Lord Durham, from Charles Attwood, Chairman of the Northern Political Union; from Perth; and from Dysart,—in favour of Parliamentary Reform.—By the Earl of Carnarvon, from Minehead, to place that Borough in Schedule B.—By the Earl of Rosslyn, from Great Grimsby, for retaining two Members; — and from the Wives and Daughters of the Free Burgesses of that Place, that their Rights, and those of their Children and future Husbands, be preserved to them.—By Lord Dundas, from the City of York, to continue York as the Place of Election for the North Riding of Yorkshire;—From Richmond (York), that that Place may be selected for holding the Election for the North Riding.—By the Duke of Gordon, from Ross;—by the Duke of Rutland, from Cheveley;—by the Earl of Roden, from Rochford, and six other places in Ireland,—against the Ministerial Plan of Education Ireland.—By the Earl of Roden, from the Trustees and Committee of the Boy and Girls School of Tuam,—in favour of the Kildare-Street Society, and against the New System of Education.—By the Earl of Harewood, from Dingwall and Elgin, for an Inquiry into the State of the West-India Colonies.

Reform—London and Edinburgh Petitions.] The Duke of *Sussex* rose to present the Petition of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of London, in favour of the Reform Bill, and he was glad that the conversation which had just passed had taken place, as he was in some measure in the same predicament as the noble Lord who had presented the Perth petition. The petition had been put into his hands as the petition of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of London, but was signed only by Mr. Woodthorpe, their Clerk. The prayer of it was, that their Lordships might speedily pass the present Bill of Reform, which they had now before them, as it was of very great importance, both in respect of the tranquillity and advantage of the metropolis, and the whole country, that it should speedily pass. He himself concurred in substance in the statements in the petition, and also in the prayer of it; and, as he had not obtruded on their Lordships' attention with any observations of his when the Bill was read a second time, he would now, with their Lordships' permission, make a few remarks on the subject. He had not troubled their Lordships on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill, because he was satisfied that the cause of Reform would be much more strongly and ably advocated on that occasion by others than by him. But in the course of the debate—he alluded only to some particular observations in that debate, and not to the debate generally, which would be irregular—but in the course of that debate, some doctrines had been maintained by certain of their Lordships, in which he could not concur, and against which he protested. One of the topics, which some of their Lordships had dwelt upon, and endeavoured to enforce, was, that certain parts of the Bill, if passed, would militate against the Coronation Oath. He had often heard that point alluded to in the debates in that House, but he had really thought that it was one which had been some time ago settled. It had been admitted by a noble Earl (Liverpool) some time ago at the head of his Majesty's Government, but now deceased, that with these matters the Coronation Oath had nothing to do. He wished, therefore, that such topics had been omitted, as they had a tendency to excite scruples in some tender consciences which might be productive of evils of which the extent could not easily be calculated. As to the merits of the Bill now before their Lordships, they were all aware that he was a decided friend to Reform, and they would not, therefore, be astonished to learn, that he assented to the Bill in its full extent. In doing so, he was satisfied that he best consulted the interests of the country; and, although he did not rest his approval of the measure entirely on the point of expediency, yet he was of opinion that it would be attended with great advantage to the community. Perhaps at a former period it might not have been necessary to have gone to so great an extent, but now it was necessary to go further than it might before have been, and, therefore, no time ought to be lost in passing this measure, which was so generally satisfactory, and yet so safe, lest, by a longer delay, more might be required, which it might not be so expedient nor so safe to grant. On looking at the Constitution, and considering its nature and operation, it struck him that the objections to this Bill were grounded in error. The Crown had the power of making Peers, but it had not the power of nominating Members to the House of Commons to represent the people. Now, if the first branch of the Legislature had not this power, he could not see that Members of the second branch of the Legislature ought to possess it. If the Crown had it not, he could not see how Peers and other individuals could constitutionally possess it. He could not see it, because he knew that Acts of Parliament had been passed which were manifestly inconsistent with the notion that Members might be returned to the House of Commons by individual Peers, or by other individuals. Acts of Parliament had been passed, by which it was provided, that, when Members of the House of Commons accepted office under the Crown, they should resign their seats, and return to their constituents. Now, if Members of the House of Commons were so to be returned to their constituents, in order to ascertain whether these constituents should approve the course of policy which they would be likely to follow, it could never be meant that they were to be thrown back upon a Peer, or any other individual, to know whether that individual would choose to return them again as Representatives to Parliament. The interests and opinions of the country could never be consulted by such a course. On the other hand, he did not think that the danger from popular election was so great as some of their Lordships appeared to apprehend. In other countries, where the people had not been accustomed to possess and exercise this power, there might be some danger in throwing the power suddenly into the hands of the people. Where the power did not exist before in the people, it might certainly be productive of a great deal of mischief suddenly to intrust them with it. But here, where the people had the power, and had been accustomed to exercise it, there was no danger, in extending, in a moderate degree, the power which the people had long possessed, and such only was the effect of the Bill now before their Lordships. The power so placed would not be, generally speaking, so mischievously exercised as if it were placed in the hands of individuals. He thought it right to state this much, as he considered it his duty to support the Bill as it stood, and it had his full and complete support. Schedules A and B he considered of vital importance. As to the 10*l.* clause, it was not going further than had been done in the case of Ireland: 10*l.* had been fixed upon as the lowest qualification for a freeholder in that country, and he did not think that a 10*l.* householder was too low a qualification for England. As to the clause respecting the metropolitan districts, that too had his full assent and support. Considering the matter on the principle of population and property, he found, from Parliamentary Returns, that the people of London and Southwark paid one-third of the Assessed Taxes of the whole of the kingdom of England and Wales; so that, looking to population or property, patriotism and intellect, the metropolitan districts were fully entitled to the portion of the elective franchise placed in their hands by this Bill. He had been anxious to say this much, and he had said it in general terms, as it had been his wish to follow the example set him by the noble Earl at the head of the Administration, who had supported the measure in the most conciliatory manner, and with an anxiety to avoid giving personal offence to any one. He now moved, that the petition be laid on the Table.

The Marquis of *Salisbury:* As the petition had not the Corporation seal to it, it could only be received as the petition of the clerk who signed it.

Earl *Grey:* It was quite common for the petitions and acts of the Corporation to be so authenticated. He was informed that it had been so from a very early period.

The Earl of *Eldon* admitted that the petition should be received, but it could be only as the petition of the clerk.

Lord *Ellenborough* refused to receive any petition as that of the Corporation that had not the Corporation seal affixed to it: they were consulting not only the privileges of that House, but also those of the Corporation of London.

The Duke of *Sussex:* It was the petition of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of London.

Petition laid on the Table.

The *Lord Chancellor* had to present to their Lordships a petition in favour of the measure of Reform now before them, from the inhabitants of the city of Edinburgh; and although he admitted that the petition was signed only by the Chairman, the Secretary, and twelve persons chosen out of the meeting, in behalf of the whole meeting, and could only be received as their petition, yet there never was a petition which better than this deserved the name of the petition of the inhabitants of Edinburgh. The meeting was attended by a vast concourse of the population of Edinburgh and its vicinity; and he believed that he was much under the mark, when he stated the numbers who attended to be 40,000. He had very good reason to believe that it was considerably beyond that number—and no meeting was ever more zealous in support of the cause for which it was assembled; and no meeting, even of a small number, was ever conducted in a more temperate and peaceful manner. Neither in coming to the meeting, at the meeting, nor in departing from the meeting, was there the least appearance or manifestation of violence, but all was conducted with the utmost decorum, and he had only to state what was the prayer of the petition—observing that, although the petition was signed only by fourteen names, the prayer was most thoroughly and cordially joined in by the whole body of this most numerous and most respectable meeting, and also by the vast majority of the whole body of the country. The petitioners expressed their high satisfaction that their Lordships had agreed to the second reading of the Bill, and they earnestly prayed their Lordships speedily to pass it into a law. They stated that such was not only their wish, but that of the vast majority of the country, and prayed that it might pass without any alteration at all affecting its principle. Such was the petition, and such were the petitioners; and he now moved, that the petition be laid on the Table.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, there could be no objection to receive it as the petition of those who signed it. But he could not help observing, that the Bill, in which the petitioners were more particularly concerned, was not before the House.

The Duke of *Buccleugh* had no doubt but there was a numerous meeting of the people of Edinburgh and its vicinity in the King's Park, but he was informed that a very great proportion of those who attended were attracted to it merely by curiosity. He admitted, however, that it was conducted with great propriety and decorum, as that object had been particularly attended to by those who had got up the meeting with great anxiety and trouble. But he denied that the great majority of the meeting consisted of the most respectable and intelligent people of Edinburgh and its vicinity; for a petition of a contrary tendency had been presented to the King from the most respectable and intelligent of the inhabitants of Edinburgh and its vicinity, signed by 1,700 names, representing 27,000,000*l.* of property; and this petition (this was the first opportunity that he had of noticing the fact) was inserted in *The Gazette* as a petition in favour of Reform. Something out of the middle of the petition was inserted in *The Gazette*, leaving out some of its most important terms and statements. This petition, therefore, was not that of the majority of the most respectable and intelligent of the inhabitants of Edinburgh and its vicinity.

The Earl of *Camperdown* did not by any means intend to deny the respectability and intelligence of the 1,700 petitioners mentioned by the noble Duke; but, at the same time, he must observe, that it was a petition agreed to at a meeting which was completely exclusive. No one was allowed to attend it, who did not profess to hold certain political opinions; and he would ask, whether the opinion of 1,700 persons, out of a population of about 150,000, was to be considered as any indication that the majority of the population and intelligence, or the weight of property of Edinburgh and its vicinity, was averse to the present measure of Reform? On the contrary, the very circumstance that such a comparatively small number could alone be procured to sign the adverse petition, was a conclusive proof that the vast majority of the respectability and intelligence of Edinburgh and its vicinity, represented by the immense body which formed the meeting where the present petition was adopted was decidedly favourable to the measure. Notwithstanding what had been said by the noble Duke, who had great property and influence, and was highly respected for his generous and liberal character in that country, he differed entirely from the noble Duke as to his estimate and opinion of the meeting at which this petition was agreed to. That meeting was attended by many persons of large property and of high respectability, intelligence, and talent; and speeches were delivered at it which would not have disgraced any assembly whatever. The Preses or Chairman of the meeting was well known in Edinburgh to be a person of the highest talent and character. The general feature of the meeting was that of a meeting of the middle classes; and he hoped that the admirable decorum and temperance with which it had been conducted would for ever put an end to the false imputations that had sometimes been thrown out, that such persons could not meet for political purposes without violence and outrage. He knew how highly the noble Duke's character was estimated in Scotland, but, notwithstanding the opinion pronounced by the noble Duke, he must say, that this meeting was most respectably as well as most numerously attended, and any one that chose was admitted to it without distinction—a very different mode of proceeding from that which had been adopted at the meeting whose petition the noble Duke had presented to the King. He was sorry to have troubled their Lordships even with these few observations, but, after the statements of the noble Duke, he felt it his duty not to allow them to pass without notice.

The Earl of *Roseberry* was very sorry to intrude on their Lordships' attention, but, as the subject was of the greatest importance, he hoped they would indulge him with their attention for a few moments. From the information which he had received, and which was likely to be correct owing to the relation in which he stood to that part of the country, he could fully confirm everything that had been said by his noble friend who spoke last. He knew the influence of the noble Duke in Scotland, where he was highly and deservedly esteemed, and he was most happy to hear from him, that this was a large and respectable meeting, and that it had been conducted with the utmost regularity and decorum that could have been exhibited even at the smallest meeting. As to the meeting of the 1,700, he would say that it was not only exclusive, and called purposely and exclusively of those who were opposed to the measure, but that, in order to catch votes and signatures, it was studiously circulated that the petition was opposed only to a part of the present plan, and went to support a very considerable measure of Reform, and this was the explanation of the statement in *The Gazette*, as to the nature and object of that Petition. So much was said in it in favour of Reform, that the conductor of *The Gazette* or whoever had the charge of that department, was led to suppose that it was a petition in favour of the Reform Bill. This was the way in which so many signatures had been gained to the petition which had been presented to the King by the noble Duke, and if it had been fairly stated that it was an Anti-Reform petition, the result would have been very different. He thought it his duty to make these few observations. The present petition, in his opinion, did express the sentiments of the vast majority of the respectability and intelligence of Edinburgh and its vicinity.

The Duke of *Buccleugh* observed, that the reason of the exclusion to which the noble Earl had alluded was the very evident one of preventing the attempt to introduce a large body of persons hostile to the purpose for which the Meeting was expressly called, and who would have endeavoured to defeat that purpose.

Petition to lie on the Table.

The *Lord Chancellor* presented a number of other petitions to the same effect; and, adverting to the petition which he had already presented, observed that although curiosity might perhaps have been the motive of some of those who attended the meeting at which that petition originated, the deepest interest in the subject was felt by the great mass of the persons present. It had been computed that of those persons there were 1,600 whose incomes averaged 1,700*l.*; and if the amount of the average incomes under the income tax were remembered, it must be allowed that that indicated a condition of high comparative property.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND—COMMITTEE.] On the Motion of Earl Grey, the House then resolved itself into a Committee on the Reform Bill.

Earl *Grey* observed, that as this important question was now in the stage in which it would be necessary for their Lordships to occupy themselves with the details of the measure, he would state the course which it was his intention to pursue with respect to it. In the first place, he should move that the title be postponed. In the second place, he should move that the preamble be postponed. These Motions being merely matters of course, he trusted that no opposition would be made to them. Their Lordships would then come to the consideration of the various clauses of the Bill; and it might be convenient that he should take an early opportunity of stating an alteration which it was his intention to propose in the first clause. In conformity to what was certainly the natural course of proceeding when it was determined to disfranchise a certain number of boroughs, when the new Bill was brought into the House of Commons, the number having been sanctioned by the House, it was provided by the first clause—" that each of the fifty-six boroughs enumerated in the schedule marked A, to this Act annexed, should, from and after the end of the present Parliament cease to return any Member or Members to serve in Parliament." Perhaps, however, there might be some objection to that mode of proceeding in the House of Lords. He understood that there were noble Lords, who, admitting the principle of the disfranchisement, were of opinion that the number of boroughs to be disfranchised should not be fixed until the schedule A had been considered. To obviate such objections, it was his intention when the Committee came to that part of the first clause, in which the number fifty-six was mentioned to propose the omission of the word "fifty-six." The clause would then stand—" That each of the boroughs enumerated in the schedule A should cease to return any Member or Members to serve in Parliament." This seemed to him to be the more regular course of proceeding—a course more congenial to the character of the measure, as well as calculated to obviate the objections made to the construction of the clause as it then stood. At present, however, he should only move that the title of the Bill be postponed.

Title postponed accordingly.

Earl Grey moved that the Preamble of the Bill be postponed.

Preamble postponed.

Lord *Lyndhurst*, so far from being opposed to the noble Earl's Motion, was disposed to carry it further. The noble Earl had intimated his intention to propose an alteration in the first clause of the Bill. He (Lord Lyndhurst) rose for the purpose of proposing the postponement of the consideration of the clause altogether. If he should succeed in persuading their Lordships to agree to that proposition, he intended to follow it up by proposing that the consideration of the clause which immediately followed should also be postponed. His object was, to submit to their Lordships the propriety of taking into consideration those clauses by which certain places not at present represented were to be allowed to send Members to the House of Commons, and to determine what number of places should be enfranchised, before they entered into the consideration of what places should be disfranchised. He begged leave to call their Lordships' attention for a moment to the position in which they were at present placed with respect to the Bill. Their Lordships had decided (and he was bound to respect that decision) that the Bill should be read a second time, and that it should be referred to a Committee. Now, what was the point which their Lordships had decided? Their Lordships had decided in favour of the principle of the Bill. Undoubtedly a question might be raised as to what was fairly to be considered the principle of the Bill. It was a question which might certainly admit of much discussion, much consideration, and much argument. But having on the second reading attended closely to the whole course of the debate, he was bound to state, that it was evident that the noble Lords who voted for the second reading of the Bill intended to establish the principles of the enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and the extension of the elective franchise. He was bound to consider that as the decision of their Lordships; and in his future proceedings with respect to the Bill, he should act uniformly and constantly in conformity to that decision. But although by agreeing to the second reading of the Bill, their Lordships had acknowledged its principles, they had not in the slightest degree fettered themselves as to the extent to which those principles should be carried. They had determined that there should be enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and an extension of the elective franchise, but they were perfectly free with respect to their determination how far those three principles should be carried. Their Lordships would allow him to say, that after all the discussions which had taken place upon this most important question in both Houses of Parliament, and looking at the feeling of the country and the general expectation that had been created, he was bound to state that, after the best consideration which he had been able to give to the subject, and after having consulted with others respecting it, he was not himself disposed, nor did he believe that any of the noble Lords with whom he acted were disposed, to propose such alterations in the measure as, if they were adopted, would ultimately render the character of the Bill such as not to be satisfactory—he would not say to the Radical party—but to all the intelligent classes of the community; or such as ought not to be satisfactory to the noble Earl himself. With respect to the manner and tone in which this important measure was to be considered, as far as he himself was concerned, and he was sure that he might add as far as those noble Lords with whom he acted on the occasion were concerned, it would be a manner and tone of temper, candour, and conciliation. He was persuaded that this tone and manner would be met by a correspondent tone and manner on the other side of the House. He relied on this on the part of the noble Earl, from his knowledge of that noble Earl's general character. It might be said in that House, as it had been said out of that House, that those who opposed the Bill were actuated by a spirit of personality and party. For himself he disclaimed being actuated by any such spirit. Independently of this question the noble Lords on his side of the House had, from time to time, felt it their duty to comment on other measures of his Majesty's Government during the period at which the noble Earl opposite had been at the head of that Government. But he would confidently say, from his knowledge of those noble Lords, that at no period of the history of the country during the last hundred years, had an opposition to Government been carried on less in the spirit of party and personal feeling. He would confidently say, from his own knowledge, that there never had been an opposition to Government possessing less of the concert and co-operation which usually characterised a party. With respect to the particular measure under their Lordships' consideration, the opposition to it had been occasioned by no party or personal feeling. He—and the observation was equally applicable to many other of their Lordships—had opposed the principle of the Bill, because, having endeavoured to inform his mind upon the subject, he had arrived at the conviction, that if the Bill were passed in the shape in which it had been sent up by the House of Commons, the effect would be the destruction of the rights and just authority of the House of Lords and of the Crown. That was his conscientious opinion; and he would dare any man to say that it was not so. Such being the case, what could he do but oppose the Bill? How could he act otherwise? It was on his thorough conviction of the mischievous effects which would result from the adoption of the measure. What he now meant to propose was the postponement of the first and second, or disfranchising clauses, until after their Lordships had considered the enfranchising clauses, conferring the right of Representation on places by which it had not hitherto been enjoyed. He begged that he might not be misapprehended. What he proposed was simply the postponement of the clauses. His proposition did not involve any pre judgment of the question. If he might use the language of his profession, he simply desired to postpone the clauses "without prejudice" to their being subsequently and fully considered. He would briefly state to their Lordships the grounds on which he proposed this postponement. He considered that a Bill of this description ought to be essentially a Bill of enfranchisement. That doctrine he had always held. When he first addressed their Lordships on the subject he had said so, and had then objected to the Bill because it bore the appearance of a bill of disfranchisement instead of enfranchisement. The Reform measure ought to be a Bill of enfranchisement; and disfranchisement ought to be only the consequence of that enfranchisement. He knew no other principle on which such a bill ought to proceed. If it were considered necessary for the benefit of the State to enfranchise a great many large towns, it might be considered necessary to disfranchise a number of other places. On that point he would give no opinion. But he confidently maintained that the enfranchisement must be the measure of disfranchisement. The particular cases of disfranchisement must be decided on their merits, and after inquiry; but with reference to the general question, the question of disfranchisement must depend on the necessity created for it by the extent of the enfranchisement. They must know the extent of the enfranchisement before they could proceed with propriety to consider the extent of the disfranchisement. The Amendment, therefore, which the noble Earl had signified his intention of moving in the first clause although a very important Amendment, did not meet the object which he (Lord Lyndhurst) had in view. The Amendment to be proposed by the noble Earl was, to leave out the words "fifty-six," thereby substituting simply the boroughs specified in the Schedule. But that was to disfranchise before they enfranchised. If the noble Earl did not mean to propose the immediate adoption of the clause, he (Lord Lyndhurst) would not press his proposition. If the noble Earl, after the omission of the words "fifty-six" in the clause, did not mean to move that the clause be embodied in the Bill, he (Lord Lyndhurst) would not persevere in his proposition. But as that did not appear to be the noble Earl's intention, he (Lord Lyndhurst must proceed. The course which he recommended would be far more gracious to the whole community than the course recommended by the noble Earl. The course which he recommended was to begin by enfranchising, to begin by conferring rights and privileges, to begin by granting boons and favours; whereas, the course recommended by the noble Earl was to begin by disfranchising, to begin by depriving a portion of the community of the rights and privileges which they at present enjoyed. The power of returning Members to the Commons House of Parliament was admitted in the preamble of the Bill to be a right and a privilege. But it was not in the preamble of the Bill alone that it was so described. One of the most eminent lawyers that had ever lived—a Whig too in politics—he meant Lord Chief Justice Holt, had termed the power of returning Members to the Commons House of Parliament "a transcendent right, of which no tribunal could deprive the people;" and all the other eminent men who had adorned that and the other House of Parliament, down to the present time, had been of the same opinion. There was another consideration which pressed upon his mind, and which he begged leave to state to their Lordships. If they adopted the course which he recommended, they would disfranchise as a matter of necessity; if they adopted the course recommended by the noble Lords opposite, they would disfranchise certain boroughs because they were blots on the Constitution—they would abate them as nuisances. Now, would any noble Lord, having the character of a statesman, say, that the course which he recommended was not the more conciliatory and healing? When the tone and temper which had been manifested out of doors on this subject, at meetings and in writings, were considered—when it was known, that the House of Commons had been called a boroughmongering Parliament, and that it was asked, what obligation there was to obey the laws which had been passed by such a Parliament, or to pay the debt which a corrupt House of Commons had accumulated, their Lordships ought surely to pause, before, by any proceeding of theirs, they gave a sanction to such doctrines. The Lord Privy Seal had that evening presented a petition from the Northern National Union. He (Lord Lyndhurst) would take the liberty of reading the language which had been used by the individual who had moved the first Resolution at a recent meeting of the Northern Political Union; and would then put it to their Lordships, whether they would do anything that should give an apparent sanction to the doctrine maintained. "Let us get our Reformed Parliament," said the speaker—'our House of Delegates,' (he thanked the Duke for teaching him that word)—and we shall soon manage our 'delegation' so as to do good to ourselves." After some other observations, with which he would not trouble their Lordships, the speaker proceeded:—"He next came to that pretty affair, the eight hundred millions of debt. Upon that head, he would speak with sincerity, and brave obloquy, which he knew he should get in some quarters. Who borrowed this money [a voice: 'I got none of it']? He dared say, his friend told the truth, for the English boroughmongers borrowed it. And for what? To put down Reform at home and freedom abroad—to perpetuate their own profitable abuses. Had they any right to saddle us and our children with this debt? He denied it flatly and *in toto;* he abjured the whole loan system. A nation had *de facto* only a life-interest in the soil and property; they could not alienate or will it away. They could not sell the country in a lump and spend the money. Now, a man with a life-interest only cannot mortgage, nor burthen the heir: this is the law of nature and civilization also. But if this was as he said, could they mortgage the blood and bones, the minds and bodies of their descendants? Monstrous idea! and yet this had been attempted by them; for, before a shilling of profit or maintenance could be obtained by farmer, merchant, or manufacturer, he must first work out his share of the taxes to pay the interest of the "Debt," as it was called: this could not continue. He was for no unmerciful dispensation to the fundholders; they were innocent, and ought to be paid, as far as all disposable public property could pay them; for the rest, some sort of compromise must be made—and by a Reformed Parliament, in time, it would be made—the thing was inevitable, and time would prove it so." Nor was this a solitary specimen of the doctrine. But was it a doctrine to which their Lordships would give their sanction? Such, however, would be the result of adopting the course recommended by the noble Lords opposite. Let them enfranchise first, and afterwards disfranchise, if necessary, and only to the extent of the necessity. Such, he would take upon himself to say, had been the course recommended by all the eminent Reformers who had previously proposed to amend the constitution of Parliament. Their system had been, either that there should be no disfranchisement at all; or, if there were any, that it should be only the consequence of enfranchisement. When Lord Chatham brought forward his measure of Reform above seventy years ago, disfranchisement made no part of it. His plan was to add 100 Members to the House of Commons, to be elected by counties and great towns. What were Mr. Pitt's plans? In 1783, Mr. Pitt proposed, like his father, to add 100 Members to the House of Commons; but, unaccompanied by disfranchisement, except when it could be proved that any borough had conducted itself improperly, and had thereby forfeited its right to the elective franchise; in which case the inhabitants of that borough were to sink into the general mass. In 1785, Mr. Pitt brought forward another and a more important plan of Reform, the object of which was, to add seventy-two Members to the House of Commons. Enfranchisement was thus the principle of the measure, although it comprehended disfranchisement in a qualified way, a sum of money being to be set apart for the purchase by the nation of boroughs. That disfranchisement, however, was to be the consequence of enfranchisement. Among other places, Sheffield and Birmingham were to have Members. When Mr. Flood brought forward his plan of Reform, it was, like that of Lord Chatham, to add 100 Members to the House of Commons; but disfranchisement formed no part of his measure. He next came to the plan proposed by the noble Earl (Grey) opposite, in 1797, the main feature of which was the great increase of the Members returned by counties. On the general merits of that plan, it was not necessary for him to make any observation, nor was he disposed to do so, after what had been observed, with respect to it by the noble Earl himself—"that much of it was to be ascribed to the heat and inexperience of youth." That brought him to the plan introduced some years ago by the noble Lord (Lord John Russell), who was the ostensible mover of the Bill now on their Lordships' Table, as well as of that which had preceded it in a former Session. The plan introduced by the noble Lord was in the shape of four Resolutions, the second of which declared it expedient to give Representatives to the large towns then unrepresented; but the third Resolution recommended the appointment of a Committee to consider how that enfranchisement might be best effected, without any inconvenient addition to the number of Members in the House of Commons. It was not, he thought, too much for him to infer from this proposition, that the noble Lord looked upon enfranchisement as the principle and end of his plan, and that he considered disfranchisement as the means. He did not mean to impute any inconsistency to the noble Lord, for whom he had a very high respect, but he could not avoid noticing the language of the noble Lord on that occasion. His words were—"Let us first agree as to what towns should be enfranchised, and then we shall see what is to be the extent of disfranchisement—what alterations it may be necessary to propose." But this hostility to disfranchise, or the principle of regarding it only as a means, not as an end or object of Reform, was not confined to the noble Lord whose name he had mentioned. He thought that, in the speeches, as well as in the writings, of his noble and learned friend (the Lord Chancellor), the same principle was adhered to. His noble and learned friend had, he conceived, given sufficient evidence, that he also looked upon enfranchisement as the great end of Reform, and that, if he regarded disfranchisement at all, it was to be only as a means. In a celebrated letter which his noble and learned friend had written, he had made use of these words: "Above all things let us have no disfranchisement." He did not mean to charge his noble and learned friend with inconsistency in this respect; but he was anxious to quote him as a very high authority for the course which he (Lord Lyndhurst) pointed out. He thought it would be allowed that he had shown good authority for his assertion, that, in the various propositions which had been made for Reform, enfranchisement was the principle, and disfranchisement only the consequence. Their Lordships would also allow him to say, that the course which he recommended was in the spirit of the ancient Royal prerogative. Anciently, the King, by his prerogative, had the right to issue his precepts to places not heretofore represented. That was a right which enabled the Crown from time to time to adapt the Representation to the changes of the period, and to avert the mischievous consequences which might have resulted from its being stationary. This prerogative remained down to the time of King Charles 2nd, who, as was well known, had sent a writ to the town of Newark—if, he repeated, that prerogative still existed in the Crown, there could be no difficulty in adjusting the principle of enfranchisement. But that prerogative no longer existed, and, at no time, was the power of disfranchisement recognized by law as belonging to the Monarch. He knew it had been held, that the Crown had the power of withholding writs from places which had gone to decay, but this power had been most formally disavowed, first by a Committee of the House of Commons; afterwards by the decision of the Judges of the land, and, eventually, by Parliament itself. In the reign of James 1st, four boroughs complained to the House, that precepts had not been sent to them, to return Members as usual in the case of a new election. The House appointed a Committee to inquire into the matter, and the Committee, which, as their Lordships knew, numbered Selden and Sir Edward Coke amongst its members, decided, that the precepts could not be legally refused them. The matter was afterwards referred to the Chief Justices of the Courts, and the decision of the Committee was confirmed; and it was, as he had said, subsequently confirmed by Parliament itself, and the precepts were issued. The town of Winchester and Pomfret were instances of the same kind, in the same reign. He (Lord Lyndhurst) must contend, then, that the power of the Crown not extending now to the issuing or withholding writs from places which sent Members to Parliament being admitted, and that the plan of all the great Reformers, from the time of Lord Chatham to the present day, having been formed, as he had shown, on the principle of enfranchisement as an end, and disfranchisement as a means, he was acting in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution, and in conformity with even the practice of modern Reformers, in proposing that their Lordships should first consider the question of how far they were disposed to carry the enfranchising principle, before they took into consideration the question of disfranchisement. Having stated the arguments which occurred to him on this point, he could assure their Lordships, that, in taking this course, he did not mean to prejudice the question of disfranchisement, for their Lordships could afterwards measure the extent of disfranchisement by the extent to which they should feel disposed to carry the principle of enfranchisement. He would now, therefore, move, that the first and second clauses of the Bill be postponed.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, he was sure that his noble and learned friend could not have distinctly heard what fell from his noble friend (Earl Grey) near him, from the construction he had put upon his observations as to the course he proposed with respect to the first clause. His noble friend proposed, as a course which was likely to be more convenient to their Lordships, that the words "fifty-six" should be omitted from the first clause, because, as his noble friend had observed, it might be not agreeable to many of their Lordships to be tied down in the first instance to the disfranchisement of so many boroughs, but his noble friend had never meant or said, that it was not his intention to propose the disfranchisement of that number of boroughs. On the contrary, he had most distinctly and emphatically added, that it was his intention to propose the disfranchisement of those boroughs—that was, that each of them should *seriatim* be inserted in schedule A. He was anxious to set his noble and learned friend right on this point, lest, by possibility, it could be supposed that his noble friend near him, or he, or any of his noble colleagues, could, for one moment, think of going back one atom from what they considered the essential principles of the Bill. The course which his noble friend proposed, was for the sake of the convenience of their Lordships, for he admitted that there would be an inconvenience attending the clause if it were proposed at once that fifty-six boroughs should be disfranchised. Therefore it was, that his noble friend proposed to omit those words from the clause, but with the certain intention of proposing each one of the fifty-six boroughs to be inserted in it as they went on. He was fully disposed to give his noble and learned friend credit for the disclaimer he had made of want of candour, or of the existence of any factious party spirit in the proposition he now made; but, if he were to judge of him by the party with which he was acting, and to which party his noble and learned friend had most marvellously, as it appeared to him, assigned the absence of all factious or party motives—if he were to weigh all that they had lately done with respect to this Bill, and to the Government by which it was introduced, he should not be disposed to give his noble friend that credit for candour and fairness which he then most unfeignedly did. He was unwilling to go back to all the proceedings of that party; but without going further back than that most unfactious and most candid course, which that party took on the occasion of the system of education lately adopted in Ireland, he must say, that, when he recollected the various castes and degrees of party who were united on that question, for the purpose of showing, no doubt, their very good will to Government—when he recollected the strange union which was then made to assert a principle different from that on which Government acted—they might be right—they might have considered that they were taking a right course as conscientiously as he believed that they were wrong—but when he recollected the union formed on that occasion, of men who could not agree on any one point, but that in the plan they were pursuing they were opposed to the Government—when he recollected these circumstances, he must own, that, if he were to measure his noble and learned friend's candour by that of those with whom he acted, he should not be disposed to give him as much credit for that quality as he should willingly do if he were to consider him in his individual character, and distinct from party association. Considering, then, this Motion—considering by whom it was proposed, and by whom it was likely to be supported, he could look upon it in no other light than as proposing to negative the most important part of the Bill. If his noble and learned friend, instead of wrapping himself in generalities, would only say, that there was any important part of the Bill with which he would agree—if he would even now say, that he did not object to the principle of schedules A and B, but that he would rather that schedules C and D should be taken first—then he could understand the ground of his objection, and might be disposed to accede to it, (though he should still think that the taking the clauses in their order in the Bill would be the more desirable course.) If even his noble and learned friend would point out that there was something for which they ought to wait before they proceeded to the discussion of that clause, some information which they had not yet obtained, but which might be forthcoming at a later period of the discussion, he should not think his Motion unreasonable; but when his noble and learned friend left them in the dark as to all that, and as to his own intentions and those of the party with which he acted, with respect to those clauses, at a future period, he must think that the proposition was made only to get rid of the clause altogether, and, therefore, it should have his most decided opposition. His noble and learned friend had, in order to induce their Lordships to agree with him in this Motion, taken rather a strange course, if his object were only the mere postponement, and not the total, defeat of the clause. He had alluded to opinions which were expressed elsewhere, and his noble and learned friend had read and commented upon a speech delivered at a public meeting somewhere in the north. He did not think it worth while to follow his noble and learned friend into any examination of that speech, for he did not think it fair to pick out words from a speech at a public meeting out of doors; indeed, he should think it hardly fair to do so to a speech delivered in any place, he would not except even the two highest and most important scenes of public discussion, the two Houses of Parliament. If he were disposed to make selections for the sake of comment on the speeches delivered in either of those Houses, or in the acts of the Houses themselves, he should be at no loss to find abundant subjects for remark, and that, too, not in the way of any cordial approbation. For instance, he had heard in one House of Parliament of a proposition made—aye, and carried, too—and carried by a large majority, a majority of which, as expressing the sense of the then Representatives of the people, he was bound to speak with all due respect; but he had heard of a proposition moved in that House, and carried by that majority, which, in gross absurdity, was not exceeded by any of the wildest or most extravagant which he had ever heard made out of doors—a proposition not only against the abundant evidence of the experience of that day, but against common arithmetic. Had not Members of the House of Commons actually proceeded to the extremity of voting, in spite of the evidence of their senses, that a one-pound note and one shilling was equal in value to one guinea in gold, for the express purpose of making it a misdemeanour to give more than twenty-one shillings for a guinea, at a time when a guinea was worth, and invariably sold, for twenty-eight shillings? He mentioned this circumstance only to show how unsafe it was for his noble and learned friend to come to any conclusion upon such grounds. The objects of the various motions made at different times by various friends of Parliamentary Reform, had been brought under their Lordships' notice, and in those instances certainly enfranchisement was the main object. Yet there was one great measure of Parliamentary Reform which had not been alluded to, and in which the main, the sole principle, was disfranchisement, and not enfranchisement. He referred to the union with Ireland, in which, out of 300 Members, 200 were disfranchised. Still he would admit, generally speaking, that those measures began with enfranchisement. His own authority had been quoted; but, he would ask, did two-and-twenty years make no difference? Did two-and-twenty years produce no important changes in the circumstances of the nation, and in the character and condition of the people? He had known the lapse of two-and-twenty weeks effect a most important change in the opinions, of not a few, but of a majority of the Members of that House, on a question of constitutional policy of the most vital character. The circumstances which had occurred in the course of two-and-twenty weeks were of such a nature as to withdraw from the ranks of the opponents of that measure a large proportion of those who formerly voted against it, and to enrol them under the banners of its friends and supporters. Did he mention this in disparagement of those individuals, his noble and learned friend among the rest? On the contrary, he invoked their high authority—as his noble and learned friend opposite had said of himself—to prove that Statesmen ought to act according to the circumstances of the times in which they were placed. The principle of this Bill was, in the first instance, the expediency of taking away the power of voting for the Representation in Parliament from inconsiderable places. This was the foundation and basis of the Bill—then the grant of Representation to towns which had risen to importance—the addition to the Knights of the Shire—and the diminution of the expense of elections; but a more prominent feature was, the taking away those parts of our parliamentary system, the abuse of which had been found to be intolerable. It had been said by his noble and learnéd friend, that the House ought to begin at what he considered to be the right end; and, as soon as they had settled how many boroughs they would enfranchise, they could then settle how many they would disfranchise, to make up the number. This left them in uncertainty as to the main and fundamental part of the measure; for which reason he could not agree to it. But who were they who supported this Motion? Did that consideration indicate that nothing more was meant than an alteration in respect of form and order? No such thing. All who were against the Bill for any reason—all who had any fundamental objection to it—he had no manner of doubt his noble and learned friend expected to support him in his proposition. If the only object were to take away a little here, and to give up a little there, without impairing the principle of the Bill, such a proposition might deserve consideration; but it was impossible to shut one's eyes to what was passing—it was impossible not to have a full and intimate persuasion that this Motion was—he would not say framed, by his noble friend, or devised, or brought forward, by him for the purpose of catching the votes of those who were against the Bill; but that its tendency and the great objection against it was, that it would endanger, if not altogether destroy, the fundamental principles of the Bill, he had no manner of doubt. And, then, from whom did this proposition come? His noble and learned friend frankly, and in a manly manner, avowed his hostility to the Bill. He repeated the declaration of his hostility which he had made on the second reading, saying that it would unsettle the Constitution—that it would destroy the balance of the powers in the State, and that he regarded it as tending to subvert the Constitution, and that, in short, it was so ruinous, that he would enter into no consideration of the detail, for he would oppose the whole. He would, he admitted now, be disposed to see how far the principle of enfranchisement would go; and were they, he would ask, were those who were favourable to the principles as well as to the detail of the Bill, to wait and hazard the safety of that principle until they saw to what degree of enfranchisement the noble and learned Lord and his friends would go, that they might then ascertain how far they should be permitted to carry the principle of disfranchisement? For his part he confessed, that, in the prospect which his noble and learned friend held out, his hopes of gaining anything to the Bill, by acceding to the Motion, were very weak indeed. The attack, for attack it was, was made on that part of the Bill which he most valued, and which those opposed to all Reform most dreaded, for the great hatred was directed against schedule A; and, if that should be put in jeopardy, or defeated, he could easily guess how it would fare with schedule B and the rest. But if, as his noble and learned friend intimated, schedule A could be considered after the other parts of the Bill, and, if there was to be no objection to it, why might it not as well be agreed to in the first instance? The other plans of Reform to which his noble and learned friend had alluded had been brought in, it should be remembered, for the first time, and proposed in unreforming Houses of Parliament; but the plan now before the House, was brought into a House of Parliament disposed to admit the principle of Reform, and that this Bill had twice received the sanction by a large majority of one House of Parliament. Under these circumstances, and feeling that his noble and learned friend had made no case for the necessity or expediency of the course he had poposed, he should feel it his duty to give his direct and decided opposition.

The Earl of *Harrowby* was always sorry when it fell to his lot to follow the noble and learned Lord, whose eloquence placed all who were so circumstanced under peculiar difficulties. He had, however, but few observations to make, and his difficulty was the less, inasmuch as the noble and learned Lord, with all the ability he possessed, had not been able to bring forward arguments against the proposition which had been made. In declaring his concurrence in the proposition, he begged that he might not be included by the noble and learned Lord amongst those who, in desiring the postponement of this clause, meant at all in the smallest degree to object to the clause itself, or to the extent to which it was carried, if, after full consideration, it should appear advisable to carry it to its present extent He was one of those who had represented and urged, until he had brought odium upon himself, the propriety of supporting his Majesty's Government in their present measure. He had not abandoned his opinion as to the propriety of that course; but he did not think it was at all indispensable that, for the purpose of supporting the Government in the general measure, it was necessary that the decision of the disfranchisement principle should precede the discussion of the enfranchising clauses. His opinion was in accordance with that of his noble and learned friend, that the present arrangement should be reversed. He was glad to hear the announcement of the noble Earl opposite on the subject of the number of fifty-six boroughs, but he would put it to the fair consideration of all, whether the determination to propose them one by one, and to adhere to such propositions, was not in substance precisely the same? All that they could agree upon was to disfranchise that number, and those boroughs which it might appear just, expedient, or necessary to disfranchise. He (the Earl of Harrowby) did not object to the number of fifty-six as too great. If it were better for the public he would propose the disfranchisement of sixty boroughs instead of fifty-six. But he wished their Lordships to take into consideration not how many boroughs should be disfranchised, but whether disfranchisement ought not naturally and properly to follow enfranchisement. For this purpose it was only necessary to change the order of the words, and that really was the principal change effected by the arrangement. Having said so much, he knew not that it was necessary for him further to occupy the time of the House. The noble and learned Lord opposite seemed to think that he must be hostile to the Bill, if he supported this Motion. He begged to remind their Lordships how strongly he had urged the second reading of the Bill, in answer to this suspicion. As to the views of the noble Mover, or of those who might support him, he did not pretend to speak; but even supposing them to be of a nature hostile to the measure, he did not know that that consideration ought to decide them in doing what they considered wrong. The principle of enfranchisement always had stood first in measures of Reform: it always ought to stand first. That, fairly, was the whole proposition of the noble and learned Lord—and to that proposition he hoped they would accede. Before he sat down, he must express the pleasure he felt in perceiving the absence of ill temper and party rancour in the manner of conducting the debates upon this vital question. Having mixed himself up in their debates this Session, he should follow this excellent example; and he conjured all their Lordships to do the same. This was not a question in which private interests or petty party feelings should be allowed to mix. The great interests of the country were in their hands, and all that was required was, that they should keep a steady eye upon those interests, and not permit their minds to be swayed by any other consideration. Thus, and thus only, would they be able to bring to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion this great question, which, so long as it remained unsettled, paralyzed every effort that was made to secure the internal peace and prosperity of the country.

Lord *Bexley* begged to say, in reference to some remarks which had fallen from the noble and learned Lord who had spoken last but one, that the Resolution of the House of Commons was not that a one-pound note and one shilling were equivalent to a guinea, but that the public estimation rendered them equivalent. The materials were not to be tried by their intrinsic value—by weighing gold against paper, but by showing that, in the opinions of men, and in the ordinary transactions of life, they were of equal value. He knew no better test of public opinion than the verdict of a Jury, on the oath of twelve honest and independent men. It did so happen that about the time to which the noble and learned Lord referred, that very question came under the consideration of a Jury. An action was brought against a party, who tendered in payment a twenty-shilling note and a shilling, which the plaintiff refused to receive. The question was tried at the Assizes at Croydon, and the Jury found a verdict for the defendant; but the Judge informed them that they were not justified in returning such a verdict, as the law did not recognize the payment tendered. The Jury retired to reconsider their verdict, and came into Court again with a verdict for the defendant; and it was with great difficulty that, on the third time, and under the immediate direction of the Judge, they were prevailed upon to give a verdict, pronouncing the paper money not to be equivalent to gold. With regard to the question before their Lordships, after what had been said by the noble and learned Lord who spoke first at that side of the House, and by the noble Earl who had spoken last, he should trouble their Lordships with but few words. His reasons for supporting the Motion of his noble and learned friend were—first, that the great and crying grievance which was always brought forward by those who called for Reform was, that the great commercial towns were left unrepresented. To that his noble and learned friend proposed to call the attention of the House, and he agreed in thinking that it was the first grievance which ought to be attended to. Their Lordships could then consider in what mode it could be remedied with the least possible infringement of private rights. His second reason was, that he conceived they ought not to carry the remedy beyond the disease, and that they ought to limit the disfranchisement to that which was required by the enfranchisement; and it might be a question whether any disfranchisement at all, in the strict sense of the term, would be necessary; because he conceived that means might be found, by a classification of the boroughs, to prevent the destruction of the rights of any. If that could be done, it would be a great step to reconcile many to the Bill. Such an adjustment, on the principle of enfranchisement and classification of boroughs, would be that which he thought ought best to satisfy the public mind.

The Earl of *Radnor* looked upon the question which had been raised by the noble and learned Lord opposite as a question of very serious importance. The noble Earl, who had spoken last but one, had wished to prove that it was a question of no consequence whether the words "fifty-six" were left in the clause, or whether the names of the boroughs to be inserted in schedule A were voted separately, as his noble friend near him (Earl Grey) had proposed. Now, it appeared to him to be a matter of great consequence which course was adopted, and he would shortly tell their Lordships why. Those persons who advised the postponement of this clause were altogether the enemies of disfranchisement ["*No*"]. He said, yes. The noble and learned Lord, who proposed the Amendment, had frankly avowed his enmity to the Bill, and though he had stated that he should act in the Committee with the utmost fairness by the Bill, he (the Earl of Radnor) could not help feeling that the noble and learned Lord's wish to reject the Bill in toto might bias his judgment in considering its clauses. The noble Earl who had spoken second on this question had avowed himself a friend to the system of nomination boroughs. He had even told their Lordships that evening, that he did not give up one iota of the opinions which he had formerly entertained respecting their utility and advantage; and the noble Baron who had just sat down had declared it to be his opinion that if this Amendment were carried disfranchisement might be done away with altogether. The postponement, then, of this clause meant nothing else than the throwing out the clause for the disfranchisement of what some writers had not hesitated to call the shameful parts of the Constitution. He looked upon that clause as the most important clause in the Bill. Some noble Lords were of a different opinion, and maintained that the 10*l.* qualification clause was that which the people were most desirous of seeing part and parcel of the Bill. He believed quite the reverse. He admitted that there had been more talk lately about the 10*l.* clause than about the disfranchisement clause; but the reason was obvious—it was generally supposed that the nomination boroughs would be given up without a word by all parties. What was it, he would ask, which more than anything else had reconciled the country to this Reform Bill? The extent to which it carried the disfranchisement of the nomination boroughs. When the people first received the Bill with that enthusiasm of which no man now ventured to dispute the existence, it was not because they had considered the mode of enfranchisement which it proposed, but because they discovered that it made a great disfranchisement. He, therefore, concluded that the disfranchisement clause was the main clause of the Bill, and one which most interested the popular will of the country. Considering the quarter from which the proposition for postponement came, he could not look upon it as anything else than a mode of getting rid, by a side wind, of disfranchisement altogether. The noble Earl said, that there was no essential difference between the proposition of his noble and learned friend, and the Amendment upon it proposed by the noble and learned Lord opposite. He would call the attention of their Lordships to the point in which the difference between them was to be found. If their Lordships laid it down as a principle in the first instance that fifty-six boroughs were to be disfranchised, they must then look out for the different boroughs which are to form part of those fifty-six; but if they left out the words fifty-six, they would be at liberty to look out for nomination boroughs, and if they found fifty-six boroughs or even more deserving disfranchisement, they could put them at once into schedule A. The difference between the two propositions was thus nothing more than the mere difference between cause and effect. With respect to the necessity of disfranchising these nomination boroughs, he had recently had an opportunity of informing himself of the opinions which the people of England entertained upon that subject. He had recently been in Lancashire, and in travelling along the rail-road between Liverpool and Manchester, he had passed close by the decayed and insignificant borough of Newton. He had been told that it was impossible to form a conception of the effect which the existence of that borough of Newton so close to the rail-road had produced upon the minds of those who had travelled along it from the opulent and populous town of Liverpool, which was partially represented to the still more opulent and populous town of Manchester, which was totally unrepresented. The feeling as to the necessity of disfranchising such wretched and contemptible places as Newton was gaining strength daily amid the hardy and intelligent people of the north; and if they had talked lately more of the 10*l.* qualification clause than they had of the disfranchisement clause, it was, he repeated, because they supposed it was agreed on all hands that an extensive disfranchisement should take place. If their Lordships were disposed to make this Bill available to any good purpose, they must put a negative on the Amendment proposed by the noble and learned Lord.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that the only argument in the speech of the noble Lord who spoke last, consisted entirely in the objection that the Motion came from those who opposed the second reading of the Bill, and the inference that, therefore, it must have been made for party purposes. He would not follow the noble Earl upon this subject, or make any inquiry into what had been the conduct of those with whom he had the honour to act, with a view to comparing it to the conduct of a noble and learned Lord, when in another place, upon former occasions, respecting the making of public measures subservient to party considerations. He would not enter into comparisons of that sort, but he would say this—that, if ever there was a measure before Parliament the opponents of which were not liable to the imputation of party motives for their conduct, it was the measure then before their Lordships. If ever there was a set of men acting together upon common principles, whose conduct rendered them exempt from the possibility of such an insinuation, it was those men with whom he had had the honour to act during the two last Sessions of Parliament. It had been asserted by the noble Earl that this Motion had been made because they were the enemies of the Bill. For his own part he unquestionably was the decided enemy of the Bill. He was its enemy because he was convinced in his conscience that, let their Lordships do what they would with it, it never could be made anything but an evil to the country. This was his opinion of the principles of the Bill, and he would do all in his power to avert the evil which was impending over his country from its adoption, being convinced that, under it, the Government never could be carried on. But when those principles had been adopted by their Lordships, by reading the Bill a second time, he considered that it then became his duty, as an honest Member of Parliament, to come down and consider the Bill according to the principles, bad or good, upon which it had been brought in, and do what was in his power to make it as good a Bill for the country as possible, consistent with those principles. With this view he had listened to what had fallen from noble Lords, and he must say, that he had not heard one word of argument against the Motion of his noble and learned friend. It had been shown by his noble and learned friend, that according to the first principles of the Constitution, and according to all its practice, the point first to be considered by their Lordships was, that of enfranchisement; and having affirmed that, then it would be for them to consider whether, and in what manner, disfranchisement should follow; but his noble and learned friend had shown that, according to all precedent in all the sound and recorded practice of the Constitution, the principle of enfranchisement had had precedence whenever any alteration was to be made. To that no answer had been made. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had followed his noble and learned friend, and if any man had been able to answer him, it would have been the noble and learned Lord. Yet the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had said not one word upon that part of the subject. It was then in order that they should proceed according to the examples set before them by the Constitution, that his noble and learned friend had made this Motion. That was their object, and no dirty view of party interest, or intention to get rid of the Bill, which one noble Lord had appeared to insinuate. The question they now had before them was, whether or not they should go to a vote at once, declaring that fifty-six boroughs should be disfranchised by one clause, and thirty other boroughs by another clause, without knowing what they were to do in the way of enfranchisement; without first knowing what extent of enfranchisement would be required, or in fact, being acquainted with any one of the details of the Bill. And why was this? Why, because certain persons thought proper to tell them that these boroughs were nomination boroughs. Now, he confessed he could not perfectly understand with what consistency they could be asked to do this upon such a ground. He wanted to know, when these persons talked of destroying nomination boroughs, whether no nomination boroughs were to remain under the Bill? It was well known that there would. Nay, he was prepared to prove, at the Bar of their Lordships' House, that a new nomination borough would be created by the Bill as it now stood. He repeated that he had no other object in supporting the Motion of his noble and learned friend, than that the House should go regularly into the consideration of the Bill according to its principles, which had been affirmed by their Lordships. For, although he avowed himself the enemy of the Bill, and although he would, upon the proper occasion, again oppose its principles, as he had opposed them before, yet no man should be enabled to say of him that he had been found in the Committee doing otherwise than fairly attempting to make the Bill as little injurious as possible, consistently with the maintenance of those principles.

Lord *Holland* was very anxious, he said, to endeavour to assign a few of the many reasons which induced him to give his vote against the Amendment which had been so ingeniously put forward by the noble and learned Lord opposite. He felt a strong desire to address their Lordships on the present occasion, though he confessed that, from personal reasons with which it was immaterial to trouble their Lordships, but of which personal indisposition was one, he was not sure that he should be able to go through the task which he had voluntarily imposed upon himself. He was anxious, he repeated, to address their Lordships from the perfect persuasion that the Amendment proposed by the noble and learned Lord, was one which, if unfortunately it should be adopted by a majority of their Lordships, would entirely do away with the great good which they had recently effected by giving their assent to the second reading of this Bill. Of this point he was thoroughly persuaded, that the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord was inconsistent with the past decision of their Lordships [*cries of* "*No*"]. He did not say this unadvisedly, and though they might not be satisfactory to their Lordships, he would state the reasons, such as they were, which had induced him to come to that conclusion. He thought, then, that this Amendment was inconsistent with the recent decision of their Lordships—that it was irreconcileable with all reasonable and constitutional principle—and that it was fraught with the greatest evils, as it was calculated to disappoint the expectations of the Commons of England, taking that term either in its confined sense of the House of Commons, or, in the more enlarged and liberal sense of the Constitution—namely, that of the people of England. When he said that the Motion now under consideration was inconsistent with the former decision of their Lordships, he did not wish to be understood as imputing motives to any man. He did not mean to say, that the noble Duke who supported the Amendment, or the noble and learned Lord who proposed it, considered that they were doing anything contrary to what they considered the principle of the Bill, but, in his view of the question, the postponement of the disfranchisement clause, would be tantamount to a vote against the principle of the Bill. It was not what the noble Duke or the noble and learned Lord considered; the question was, what did the framers of the Bill, and what did the House of Commons, consider its principle? They considered that one great principle of the Bill stood upon those clauses against which the noble and learned Lord had directed his ingenious and powerful mind. The noble and learned Lord said, "Let disfranchisement be the consequence of enfranchisement, and then you will be acting constitutionally, and according to all precedent." Comical precedents, indeed, they would be which had always been rejected, and yet none but such precedents could the noble and learned Lord quote. "But," continued the noble and learned Lord, "if you act thus, you will be acting reasonably;" and then he held out to the House a distant hope that he would agree with it in voting for the principle of the Bill. He (Lord Holland) would contend that the precedence of disfranchisement to enfranchisement was one of the principles of the Bill—nay, more, that it was that very principle which had rendered the Bill so palatable to the people, and had made it effectual for two great and magnificent objects which the Bill contemplated. One of them was of a temporary character, and yet of great urgency and importance, for it was nothing less than the reconciliation of the people to the ancient and noble institutions of their country. The other was the revision, correction, and improvement, of the ancient principle and practice of the Constitution, by rendering it the true conservative body of the rights and liberties of the people. That was the character it had always received from all the most eminent of our Statesmen who were now no more. It was a restoration of the ancient Constitution of the country, and had been so considered by men as great and as wise as any of those who stood forward and opposed the present measure. The principles of this measure had been sanctioned by the collective wisdom of many great men, now no more, but who were now admitted to be authorities on every public question on which they had left any opinion. In considering the Motion now before their Lordships, he felt it his duty to look to the intention with which that Motion had been brought forward, as to its effect and tendency. It was very possible that the Motion was not brought forward with what the noble Duke called "the dirty view" of getting rid of the Bill. He was sure that the noble Duke's noble mind would not harbour such a view; but when a person had strong impressions on any question, it was hard to place reliance on his judgment in relation to that particular question. The noble Duke and the noble and learned Lord said, "We do not now oppose the principle of the Bill; our intention is to give it effect." But then it was to be recollected that the noble Duke and the noble and learned Lord had stated that the principle of the Bill was repugnant to their feelings, and that they detested it. He asked the noble and learned Lord who brought forward this Motion, whether he would consult a person as to the mode of doing anything who did not wish it to be done? Such a frame of mind as the noble Duke and the noble and learned Lord had on this question would naturally prevent them from forming a calm and impartial judgment on the best means of considering it. The principles of the Bill were disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and the extension of the suffrage. Of these main objects of the Bill, the first was, perhaps, the most important of all. He did not mean to disparage the other great principles. To every tittle of the other clauses of the Bill he should show, by his vote, that he was as strong a friend as any other noble Lord; but if they took the gem out of its head—if they even hesitated—they would deteriorate the measure, and take from it what would materially affect the value of the boon. What he had heard in the course of the debate on this question, he declared had excited the greatest surprise in his mind. The disfranchisement clauses were objected to because the rotten boroughs were said to have produced such advantages to the Constitution of the country. The arguments on this subject were in many instances most ingenious, but they were at once visionary and speculative, and opposed to fact and practice. The noble and learned Lord declared, that he entertained a great hostility to disfranchisement, unless the delinquency of those who exercised the franchise could be proved, or that a strong case of necessity was made out. The noble and learned Lord, however, was a party to a measure of disfranchisement much more extensive than the present, to a measure which disfranchised "at one fell swoop" three times the number of persons disfranchised by this Bill. The rights of those persons did not rest merely upon Acts of Parliament, but also on the common laws of the land, from which most of our political advantages had sprung; and he had voted most reluctantly, he confessed, for the disfranchisement of the Irish 40*s*. freeholders. That measure, which he supported because, as a whole, he thought the measure then proposed advantageous, had been justified on the ground that it increased the Protestant and diminished the Catholic interest in Ireland. The measure which the noble and learned Lord and his colleagues proposed, however, not only disfranchised Catholics, but Protestants; and it was most unjust, because many of those Protestant 40*s*. freeholders who were disfranchised had purchased the property out of which they voted from the Crown, and paid an additional value to the Government for the land, because it gave them a right to vote. Yet those persons were deprived of the franchise without being heard at the Bar, or their claims for a moment considered. He had never heard the noble Duke opposite speak with more effect or with more talent than he did when the question relating to the disfranchisement of the Irish 40*s*. freeholders was debated. The noble Duke had a difficult question to handle, but he handled it with the hand of a master. The noble Duke said, in effect, "You may talk as you like of the rights of the 40*s*. freeholders, but they are persons so circumstanced that they cannot exercise their franchise, but are dependent on others, which is not according to the intention of the Constitution." Apply that language to these boroughs, and ask yourselves whether, if the bogtrotter with his 40*s*. freehold is to be deprived of his suffrages on account of his dependence on his landlord and his priest, it is right for you to say, "We will not take away the franchise from the electors of St. Mawes, because they belong to, and are dependent upon, a great lord." Whilst on this subject, he could not refrain from observing, that their lordships had been harshly treated, not only by the friends but also by the enemies, of this Bill. It had been said, that the interests of their lordships were affected by it. He had often asked the question, how were they affected by it? He had asked that question in public—he had asked it, too, in private. He had got no answer to it in public, but he had sometimes heard an answer to it in private. Now, if the answer which he had heard given to it in private had been repeated in either house of Parliament twenty or thirty years ago, when he first came into Parliament, he believed that the man who uttered it would have been called to order, and would have had a good chance of being also sent to the Tower! Good God! could any man at this time of day be so foolish as to maintain the idea that the rotten boroughs were created for the purpose of enabling some of their Lordships to maintain an interest in the other House of Parliament? Dr. Paley was, he believed, the first writer of distinction who had broached this doctrine, and a doctrine more fallacious in principle, and more injurious in practice, could hardly be devised by the art of man. There was no borough attached either to the title or to the princely possession of any of their lordships; there was no borough which belonged to that House as a House; it was true that the boroughs had produced an effect upon that House; and perhaps one of the greatest evils of the borough system was, that it had produced a stronger effect upon that House than it had even produced upon the other House of Parliament. To borrow a phrase from one of the many able and eloquent speeches which his noble friend on the woolsack had made on this subject, he would say that "the corruption of the borough was often the generation of the Peer." But did the noble Lords opposite, who expressed such generous and chivalrous sentiments respecting the dignity of that august assembly which he was then addressing—did those noble lords mean to assert that it was right that the Aristocracy should be the gaudy insects generated by the filth and ordure of the rotten boroughs? He was prepared to show, at a fitting season, from the records of history, that the effect which the rotten boroughs had produced in this way upon the House of Lords, was far greater than the effect which it had produced in giving Members of the House of Lords an influence over the other House of Parliament. He contended that the principles of the Bill—at least what the House of Commons understood by its principles, and what he himself had understood by them when he gave his vote for the second reading of this Bill—he contended that the principles of this Bill were disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and the extension of the suffrage; and that one of its subsidiary principles was, the order in which its three great principles stood. For his own part, he considered disfranchisement as a principle absolutely necessary to gratify the wants of the people. "But," said the noble and learned Lord, "look at all the former schemes which have been propounded for a Reform in Parliament, and you will find that they are all founded on enfranchisement as a first principle, and on disfranchisement as a second." On this point he had already referred the noble and learned Lord to his own measure for disfranchising the 40*s*. freeholders; and he would now refer the noble and learned Lord to a measure of his great political idol, Mr. Pitt—he meant the Act of Union. He was not, he admitted, a fit expounder of Mr. Pitt's principles. Though not partial to his memory, he could not help observing, after a lapse of twenty years, that the memory of that statesman had received more injury from the hands of his friends than it had ever received from the hands of his enemies. He recollected well the time when Protestant ascendancy toasts were identified with the memory of Mr. Pitt in every Pitt club in the land, though it was well known that Mr. Pitt was no friend of that vulgar bigotry which sheltered its intolerance and its love of temporalities, under an hypocritical devotion to the religious principles of the Church of Ireland. He recollected well the tricks which were played off by some, not undistinguished performers on the political stage, to propagate and continue that delusion; and, therefore, he was not surprised at hearing Mr. Pitt represented as hostile to the principles of this Bill, because in his plan of Reform he had proposed enfranchisement as a first step, and had then proposed as a second to buy off the opponents of disfranchisement by giving them a compensation for the property they might lose in the disfranchised boroughs. The noble and learned Lord could not have read the speeches of Mr. Pitt very lately; he was, however, old enough to have heard them; and he might perhaps recollect that Mr. Pitt said, "This is the weak part of my measure, and one from which I naturally recoiled: I perfectly agree with my noble relation"—he forgot whether it was the late Lord Camelford or the present Mr. Banks, who opposed himself to every thing of that sort—"I perfectly agree," continued Mr. Pitt, "with my noble relative that you ought not to pay men for any loss they may sustain when deprived of the means of corruption; but I introduced this provision into my measure, because I could not hope to carry my measure without it." And why did Mr. Pitt employ that language? Because he was convinced that those who had an interest in these rotten boroughs would not be prevailed upon to support his measure of disfranchisement without some compensation. Now, he would ask the noble and learned Lord whether that was the argument which he was now inclined to address to their lordships? Did he mean to say to their lordships, "I am so friendly to your Bill—I delight so much in the moderate and deliberate manner in which you have brought it forward—I am so anxious a well-wisher to his Majesty's present Government, that I give you disinterestedly this advice—don't try your hands at disfranchisement, for disfranchisement you will not carry; but get rid of your disfranchisement clause, and then I will assist you in passing the rest of your Bill." The answer to such language would be very short, and was to be found in the vote of the House of Commons. One word more and he had done. He had for many years past taken an active part in the debates of their Lordships, but he had never had a seat in the House of Commons. Any delight, therefore, which he had ever received from the part which he had taken in politics must have been received within the walls which then enclosed him. Their Lordships would, perhaps, on that account, the more readily believe, that he had no wish to undervalue their dignity; but still he could not help asking their Lordships whether the present was one of the subjects on which it was prudent—no, he would not use that expression, because it appealed to a feeling which did not perhaps exist among their Lordships, but on which it was safe or even decorous—for their Lordships to tamper with the wishes of the Commons of England? He called upon their Lordships to place themselves for one moment in the situation of the House of Commons. He implored them to recollect that this Bill, and that this part of it especially, was intended to purify the representation of that House of Parliament, and to rid it of the filth and ordure under which it had been so long suffering. [*Hear, hear.*] He begged leave to inform the noble and learned Lord opposite, who cried hear, that he had not borrowed that phrase, offensive as it might be to his fastidious ears, from the vocabulary of the Northern Political Union. No, the noble Lord would find it in the speeches of Sir George Savile, of Lord Chatham, and of some others of the greatest statesmen who had ever adorned and benefited this country. The Commons of England were bent upon purifying their own assembly, finding it necessary to carry off the filth, and ordure, and corruption, in a parliamentary way, and so doing it was a satisfactory answer to the idle skit of the noble Duke, that this Bill was either revolutionary or a revolution. A revolution! Who ever heard of a revolution that for two years was under consideration, or that was accomplished at last in a Committee? When he heard this language about revolution used within the walls of their Lordships' House, he could hardly help fancying that he was transported to Mr. Irving's place of worship, and was listening to a rhapsody in the unknown tongues. This Bill had been brought up to their Lordships from the Commons, after undergoing a deliberate consideration in that House for the last two, or rather three, Sessions. It affected the privileges, the existence, and the purity of that body. Men of honour might say, "You take that view of this Bill; but you are calling upon us to do that which we conceive to be unjust, and which we, therefore, cannot do." Now, there was a quarter from which this argument would not come with a very good grace; for he recollected certain circumstances inducing certain men to do that which they considered wrong before it was done, and were not prepared to defend, now that it was done. He would, however, admit that the plea which he had just advanced would have been sufficient to justify any noble Lord in not supporting the principle of the Bill upon its second reading. But he asked their Lordships, whether, after they had sanctioned the view taken of the Bill by the House of Commons, by agreeing to the second reading, they deemed that it would be wise, prudent, or decorous, unless a strong case of necessity were made out, to tamper with that which the House of Commons, and, what was perhaps more material, the people of England, considered as the principle of the Bill? He again repeated, that, in considering this Amendment, he was bound to look at its tendency and effect, rather than at its professions. The noble and learned Lord had told them that he bowed with deference to the decision of the House on the second reading; and yet what course was he now pursuing? The whole of his argument was directed against the principle of disfranchisement. "I will admit," said he, "of disfranchisement as a consequence of enfranchisement, but as a principle, I abjure, abominate, and detest it." But what said the Bill which their Lordships had now read a second time? That disfranchisement was the principle of the Bill; and that enfranchisement, if it were not a consequence of, was at least subsequent to, disfranchisement. The noble and learned Lord, however, called upon the House to postpone disfranchisement. Postpone disfranchisement! The request was, in sooth, a very modest proposal. A noble Earl, who had taken a part in the discussion, and whose conduct he did not very strongly approve, had said—"This is a very simple matter, and it makes very little difference whether you enfranchise first, and disfranchise afterwards, or *vice versâ*." He had said enough to prove that he did not think it a very simple matter. Was it a simple matter, he would ask, either in the feelings of the people, or in the effect which it would produce upon them? Did their Lordships think that those who were attached to the Bill and looked forward with an earnest and ardent desire to its ultimate success would consider the postponement of the disfranchisement as a trifling matter? He shrewdly suspected they would not. They would feel that the postponement of that clause proved the existence of a strong feeling of hostility in the House against the principle of the Bill. But what said the noble Baron (Lord Bexley), who had risen to reply to his noble and learned friend's observations on the subject of the currency, and of whose speech he had unfortunately heard nothing but a few disjointed fragments? He used as an argument, which was good to those to whom he addressed it—namely, the enemies of the Bill—he used as an argument this extraordinary assertion, "I think that if you postpone this clause, there is great probability that there will be no disfranchisement at all;" and then the noble Baron expressed a hope that some trick might be performed—some adjustment or classification of boroughs might be devised—which would do away with disfranchisement altogether. After such a declaration, coming with so much frankness from such a quarter, could he entertain a moment's doubt that the object of those who proposed the postponement of this clause was either to get rid of it entirely, or to maim and mutilate the Bill in such a manner as would render it the scorn and not the delight of the people? If such were the intention of the opponents of the Bill not even avowed to themselves—if such be the secret wish of their hearts—the best mode of accomplishing it is that which they have proposed—to enfranchise first, and to disfranchise afterwards. The proposal of the noble and learned Lord was neither more nor less than this:—"Postpone your conclusion, and I'll give you any premises you may desire; but then, when I have done that, I'll make your conclusion as trifling and insignificant as possible." He acquitted the noble Duke most fully of any dirty views in supporting this Amendment: but this he was compelled by a sense of duty to say, that, whether it were a dirty way or a clean way, the present was the most effectual way to defeat this Bill; and so considering it, he felt it necessary to give his decided vote against the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord.

The Duke of *Newcastle* said, he should support the Amendment, but he could not agree in some of the observations of the noble and learned Lord. He must avow his decided hostility to the Bill in every shape or stage; and he, therefore, thought it of little consequence whether they proceeded to consider the enfranchising or the disfranchising clauses. The Bill was calculated to produce revolution, and, therefore, he was determined to oppose it. He knew this declaration would subject him to much hostility, and many reflections from those who thought differently; but he felt it his duty to express the opinions he entertained, and to act up to them fairly and conscientiously. With respect to the nomination boroughs, he would say this, however, that he was quite ready to adopt any plan and to go along with any proposal which would have the effect of tying down the patron in the exercise of the power of interference or dictation, and in purifying the system so as to leave the person nominated the full and free exercise of his discretion. He was ready to adopt any regulations, to make that part of the system less objectionable short of abolishing the small boroughs altogether. He objected also strongly to that part of the Bill which deprived freemen of their rights, and without necessity changed the whole constituency of the country. He must at the same time declare that he had no objection to the enfranchisement of the large towns which had risen into importance by the increase of commerce and manufactures.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that although a difference of opinion might prevail with respect to the correctness of the opinions entertained by the noble Duke who had just addressed the House, there was no noble Lord who would not be disposed upon this occasion, as upon all others, to do justice to the candour and manliness with which the noble Duke had avowed his sentiments. For his own part he entertained as much apprehension with respect to the measure—however it might be altered consistently with its fixed principles—as much apprehension as the noble Duke did. Nothing which he had heard, nothing which he had read, had produced the least change in the opinion which he originally entertained as to the changes which would necessarily be consequent upon the passing of the Bill. At the same time it was impossible for him not to see that the position in which the question stood was most materially altered by the dissolution of Parliament, which was acquiesced in by his Majesty. He had also, on a former occasion, taken the liberty to impress upon their Lordships' minds, how much more the position of the question would be altered if their Lordships should consent to read the Bill a second time. The question was now presented to their Lordships under circumstances different from those in which it had before stood. The principle of the Bill had received the sanction, not only of the House of Commons, but of the House of Lords, in the independent exercise of their functions, not having—he thanked God, for the honour of those who were in his Majesty's councils, and for the permanent safety of the Constitution—their numbers swelled by persons sent amongst them for the sole purpose of passing this measure. The Bill had been read a second time by the sanction of an independent majority of the House, which carried with it greater authority than a majority obtained under other circumstances could possibly have possessed. He stood controlled by that vote. He had resisted to the last, but after that vote he felt bound as a Peer of Parliament to consider the Bill in Committee, to examine and sift its clauses, with a view to the adoption of a salutary measure of Reform, and one which it might be safe for their Lordships to pass, but reserving to himself the right when the Report was brought up, of considering the question, whether it would be right to run the risk of rejecting the whole measure, should he find that it came out of the Committee in such a state, that he could not conscientiously give it his assent. Having thus recognised the principles of the Bill, he would propose nothing, support nothing, inconsistent with the principle, and he would even go further—he would support no proposition which went materially to alter the principle to which the House stood pledged. He felt it his duty to give the principle already agreed on the most extensive application, reserving only that right he claimed of rejecting the whole Bill when amended, as amended he knew it must be, should he find it more safe to run the hazard of rejecting it than to pass it. The question which had been submitted to the House that evening was one of great importance, not so much with respect to the Bill as with respect to the past and the future. To agree to the disfranchising clause in the manner proposed by Ministers was an invasion of private rights, and would form a precedent for an attack upon property of every description. He would never consent to such a course of proceeding. The noble Baron had warned their Lordships of the consequences of disappointing the expectations of the people; but it was his duty and their Lordships' duty not to yield to such representations, but to resist even the wishes of the people if they believed they could not be granted without detriment to the country. No man was more anxious than he was to preserve that good humour and proper understanding between all classes on which the noble Baron had dilated; but the noble Lord was not satisfied with the essentials, and contended that the people should also have them in that form which must eventually shake all the foundations of society and destroy everything that was valuable in existing institutions. He, therefore, supported the principle advanced by his noble and learned friend, that disfranchisement was contrary to the practice of the Constitution, and should only be resorted to in cases where a commanding reason required it. He regretted much that the speech of the noble Baron had not been made on the second reading of the Bill, and he rejoiced that it was not made at the time of the disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders of Ireland, because it was much to be feared, that if the noble Lord had spoken such a speech, that measure to which the noble Baron had then given his warmest support never could have passed. That bill for the disfranchisement of the freeholders was necessary as a safeguard, and as a consequence of other measures. That bill was a consequence, but not a cause. The present Bill came before the House under very different circumstances. He was prepared to deal with the present Bill in perfect good faith, and to support its provisions as far as they could be supported with any chance of carrying on the Government of the country under their operation. With that view he for one was ready to propose, if the present Motion was carried, that they should at once proceed to consider the places that were entitled to be enfranchised. He could assure the noble Lords opposite, that his endeavours would be directed to make the Bill a safe Bill. He would also assure them, that there was nothing insidious in the Motion, and nothing insidious in the intentions of his noble and learned friend; and he would vote for that Motion because the principle was valuable as a protection for those rights which had been conferred in past times, and a safeguard for those the Parliament might hereafter confer.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* would give his support to the Amendment. He was not aware, when he entered the House, that such an Amendment was to be made. He would support it, however, because it was consonant to the views which he had always entertained, and because it was more consonant to the principles of the Constitution and the prerogatives of the Crown than first proceeding by the measure of disfranchisement. It was more agreeable also to the existing rights of the people, none of whom he would ever disfranchise but from some strong case of necessity. On this ground he had opposed the disfranchisement of the 40*s*. freeholders. He wished to say, that in giving his support to the Amendment, he was not opposed to the Bill; for, in acknowledging the principle of enfranchisement, as he would never consent to augment the number of the House of Commons, he did, in fact, consent to the principle of disfranchisement. He was ready to give Members to the great interests which had grown up in our large towns, and he was ready to take away the franchise to make room for them, but he never could consent to disfranchise any one, except from a clear case of necessity; and he could not consent to disfranchise any one borough, till he knew what number he should be compelled to disfranchise.

Lord *Wharncliffe* could assure the noble Lords opposite, that there was no disposition on that (the Opposition) side of the House, to be niggardly with the amount of disfranchisement. The noble Duke (Newcastle) said, that he would give his support to the Amendment in order that the Bill might not pass, but that was not his view. The noble Baron (Holland) had argued the question unfairly, and he could assure the noble Baron that in voting for the postponement he did not mean to stop disfranchisement altogether. To begin with disfranchisement was, he thought, introducing a dangerous principle into the

Bill. The question was not to postpone disfranchisement altogether, but only first to see what enfranchisement was necessary, and afterwards make disfranchisement accordingly. After what had passed he could not do anything to violate the pledge he had given, and he was prepared to go the whole length of schedule A. He wished, however, to have such a plan as he could defend in his conscience, and defend in the face of the country. He wished to know how he could say what number of boroughs ought to be disfranchised till he saw what number of places were to be enfranchised? It might be that the same schedule A would be required; but before he consented to such an extensive disfranchisement, he wished to see the obligation to go so far from the extent of the enfranchisement. It might be that the disfranchisement should go further than that schedule, for he admitted that it was necessary, even in disfranchisement, to give satisfaction to the public mind. He entreated the noble Earl (Grey) to meet the views of those on that side of the House cordially, for he was satisfied, if the noble Earl did that, and did not stand upon the points and unessentials of the Bill, that the noble Earl would be able to effect what the noble Earl called the good, and which others called the evil of the Bill; he was satisfied, he said, if the noble Earl would only receive the proposition with cordiality, that he would have it in his power to pass the Bill, and form such a system of Representation as would give satisfaction to the people. The proposition was, to postpone the first clause till after the third clause was read, which would not defeat the principle of the Bill. It was not intended to defeat the principle of the Bill; and he did not and would not concur in any proposition to mutilate or defeat the Bill. In his opinion the proposition went to make the Bill safe. It was sufficient for the purposes of Reform that enfranchisement should precede disfranchisement. If the Amendment succeeded he should vote, he believed, for the whole of schedule A, and would not give his consent to any Amendment which would reduce the amount of disfranchisement.

The Earl of *Harewood* meant to give his support to the proposition of his noble and learned friend. He wished to exonerate himself from being a party to any project or indirect contrivance to defeat the Bill. If the proposition contained in it anything which he did not understand, or anything sinister, he would not support it. He wished that more time were allowed to promulgate what was meant to be proposed if the proposition were successful; and if that were the case he was sure that all feelings of acrimony on the other (the Ministerial) side would be done away. He thought if the Amendments to be proposed were seen and known they would remove all the objections which the noble Lords opposite might have to the Amendment. He had no idea that the object was to get rid of schedule A, and if it were, he certainly would not join in any such object. He believed that the plan of enfranchisement to be proposed would include all schedule A, and perhaps more, and he had no predisposition to defeat that schedule. There might be some variations, perhaps, in the places to be disfranchised, but, he believed, if the enfranchisement were first agreed to, the places to be disfranchised would be identical with those places in schedule A. There were difficulties about the question which the plan proposed by the noble and learned Lord might get rid of. If the noble Earl (Grey) did not look on the proposition in a hostile light, much might be done to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the whole question.

Earl *Grey* disclaimed all intention to impute any improper motives to any noble Lords; and he trusted that his conduct had been such, throughout the debates on this long and arduous subject, as to obtain him credit with the House, that in making the disclaimer, he was sincere in not attributing any sinister or indirect objects, or any insidious intentions to the noble and learned Lord who proposed, or to those noble Lords who meant to support the proposition. His noble friend had said, that he did not intend to defeat the measure; but the tendency and effect of the Motion, if ever a motion was calculated to have such an effect, would be to defeat the Bill. He hoped noble Lords present would not deceive themselves; but he must say, that if the Motion were successful, it would be fatal to the whole Bill. He had been willing to lend himself to any fair proposition; and, he certainly, like the noble Earl must lament that a proposition had been made which was so much against the Bill. He was pledged to the measure, not only from his conscientious conviction that its principles were sound, but also because those principles had received the approbation of the country. The principles to which he was pledged were disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and the extension of the qualification. On the two first he was ready to listen to any objection which should be made as to the details, or as to the justice of selecting particular places; but he could not consent to any reduction in the extent of either the proposed disfranchisement or enfranchisement. The third great principle which he knew had met the views and expectations of the public, which were most anxiously directed to the qualification, that principle he had satisfied himself, after much consideration, and he expected to be able to satisfy their Lordships if ever they came to that question—he had satisfied himself that in taking the 10*l.* qualification, he had not taken it on too low a scale. He was sure that in raising that qualification they would disappoint a great number of his Majesty's subjects, who had as fair a claim to take part in choosing Representatives as any persons in the country. To the principles, therefore, of the 10*l.* qualification, he felt himself irrecoverably pledged, and he could admit of no alteration in that, other than such as might secure it from abuse; but to any alteration which, under the pretence of regulating it, should have the effect of taming or raising that qualification, he could not consent. He thought it necessary to say thus much, to show to what extent he was pledged. With respect to the Motion of the noble and learned Lord, he must say, that he did not impute to the noble and learned Lord any improper motives. He could say for himself—and, he believed, the noble Duke opposite (Wellington) would confirm the assertion—that he had never engaged in any factious opposition, but on some occasions he had given the noble Duke a cordial, and, he believed, a not inefficient support. He had no reason, therefore, to impute to others anything like faction; but if, from any circumstances, he should have been inclined to impute any such motives, the character and situation of the noble and learned Lord who brought forward the Motion would not allow him to do so, for he could never believe that a person who held the high situation of one of the Judges of the land could ever make himself the low instrument of party, and he therefore gave the noble and learned Lord credit for his disclaimer. The Amendment was by some persons spoken of as being of little consequence, and relating only to a question of form. He did not consider it in that light. It appeared to him to be a question of the first consequence. If it did not entirely subvert the principle of the Bill, it materially affected it, and, therefore, it was quite impossible that he could accede to it. He could not understand upon what ground it was contended that it was necessary to enfranchise before disfranchising. The noble Duke said that no answer had been given to the noble and learned Lord's proposition—that according to the analogy of the law, the practice of former times, and the principles of the Constitution, that was the course which ought to be pursued. He was at a loss to understand how the noble and learned Lord made out that proposition. The noble Baron asked how they were to learn the necessary extent of disfranchisement till they had determined the enfranchisement. He might ask how they were to know to what extent enfranchisement could be carried till they had determined the extent of the disfranchisement. The noble Duke (Newcastle) who had stated his intention of opposing the Bill, acted openly and fairly. Another noble Lord (the Earl of Harewood) had said that he hoped they might get out of their difficulties, and that there was another plan of Reform. That plan admitted that enfranchisement was necessary; and the noble Baron (Wharncliffe) supposed that the enfranchisement would be so great as to make it necessary to disfranchise the whole of schedule A, or that he should be prepared to vote for that when he had satisfied himself that it was necessary. For his part, he thought that disfranchisement should go first, and that the Ministers had proceeded on the most natural course. The noble Lord said, that to begin with disfranchisement justified the cry which had been got up against nomination boroughs—undoubtedly it did; and upon what other ground could they be disfranchised, after the other places should be enfranchised, but on the ground that they were places unfit to return Members to Parliament? Unless they were not held to be so sacred as not to be touched, how were any places to be enfranchised? The nomination boroughs must be disfranchised on the noble Lord's plan as well as by the Bill. Let their Lordships not suppose that the slur on these boroughs was now cast for the first time. Had they not heard of these boroughs for the last century? Had not several great men, who were the steady friends and staunch supporters of the Crown—he would not say the Monarchy and the Constitution—but had not men who were staunch supporters of the Crown stigmatized these rotten boroughs, and described them as sores and ulcers which must be extirpated, before the Constitution could be restored to health and vigour. It was childish to say otherwise, and he could never admit that the Bill was the first occasion for casting imputations on these rotten boroughs. In his opinion these boroughs ought not to have Representatives in Parliament, and they ought to be taken away to make room for large and important towns. On that principle it was right to begin with them. Looking to notorious facts, and finding it was impossible to give these boroughs such constituencies as would entitle them to a share in the Representation, he must say that it was wise to disfranchise them. He had proposed to omit the words "fifty-six," that they might not be tied down to that number; and to consider all the boroughs *seriatim*, and decide on disfranchising them according to their respective merits. The noble Baron (Wharncliffe) took a different view, and invited the Ministers to throw themselves into his arms, and had referred to the disposition which the noble Lords opposite entertained to support the Bill. The noble Earl, too (Harewood), had regretted that the proposition was not such as to satisfy the feelings of the supporters of the Bill. If he saw any disposition to make such propositions as he could accede to, nobody would be more ready than he should to meet the noble Lord, always recollecting that he could not sacrifice the great principles of the Bill to which he was irrevocably pledged. But what reason had he to expect any approximation from the arguments and expressions of the noble Lords? The noble Lord who introduced the Amendment stated, that he remained of the same opinion he had before expressed, that the Bill was incompatible with the existence of the Government, and would destroy the Constitution. Was this, then, the Bill to which the noble and learned Lord could give his consent? The noble Baron, too (Ellenborough), had fairly professed his opposition to the Bill. He said, he would make it as good as he could; but the noble Baron reserved to himself the right of voting against the Bill after it was made as perfect as possible. The noble Duke spoke of taking all the mischief out of it he could, but said, he knew that, ultimately, it would be a most defective measure. How then, with these sentiments—with these opinions—(those who had voted against the Bill, declaring that they would vote against it hereafter) could he act as he had been invited to act? It was not possible that he could trust the measure in their hands with any hope that it could be brought to such a conclusion as would satisfy his conscience, and the just expectations of the public. When opinions were so divergent, union was impossible, When the noble Baron (Wharncliffe) said, that he might confide in the support of noble Lords opposite if the alterations were made, he must say, that the hopes which the noble Baron held out to him were so small, that it was not possible for him to act as the noble Baron wished, consistently with his duty. Certainly, to the proposition made he gave his most decided opposition, and he hoped that noble Lords would not deceive themselves by supposing that, if they acceded to the Motion, it would be possible to carry the Bill successfully through. "Should the Amendment be carried (said the noble Earl), it will be necessary for me to consider what course I shall take. More I will not say, than what, on a former occasion, was stated by the noble Earl on the other side, and it was not denied by any other person that this Bill had found support in public opinion. Noble Lords deceive themselves, if they suppose that opinion in favour of this Bill is relaxed; and, certainly, I dread the effect of the House of Lords opposing itself as an insurmountable barrier to what the people think necessary for the good government of the country and a sufficient representation." More he would not say than that to the Motion of the noble and learned Lord he meant to give his most determined opposition.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* addressed their Lordships, but was very imperfectly heard below the Bar. He said that, anxious as he was that the vote of that night should be come to without any thing like difference or dispute, he could not be content to give a silent vote, after the speech which he had just heard. The noble Earl had spoken of the Motion of his noble and learned friend as one of vital consequence to the Bill, and he had menaced their Lordships if they should adopt that Motion. That was an extraordinary proceeding, but it was not more extraordinary than the course of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who rose to answer the arguments with which his noble and learned friend had supported his Motion. The noble and learned Lord had commenced his speech by deprecating all departure from the matter specially before the Committee; and he had declared it to be his intention to pursue it in a direct line, to adhere rigidly to it, and to confine his remarks strictly to the proposition before the Committee. Such was the declaration of the noble and learned Lord, and yet the very first step he had taken in the direct line was, to involve himself in all the labyrinths of the Irish Education Resolutions. The noble and learned Lord, plunging into that intricate question, inferred that every noble Lord who disapproved of the conduct of the Government respecting it was biassed upon the present Question, and unfit to act impartially in the Committee. The conclusion appeared to him a strange one, but whether sound or not, he was exempt from its operation; for, on the Resolutions respecting education in Ireland he had not voted at all. He felt the subject to be an extremely difficult one, and he had preferred withholding the expression of any opinion respecting the Resolutions. If, therefore, the conduct of noble Lords with respect to these Resolutions was to be the test of their impartiality, he must be accounted impartial. But that strange criterion did not satisfy the noble and learned Lord: he proceeded to another topic still more curious. He had adverted to an extraordinary vote once come to by one of the Houses of Parliament, to the effect that the bank note, which in reality was of the value of 15*s*., was of the value of 21*s*., and he had said, that the proposition of the noble and learned Lord (Lyndhurst) was to the like effect: how the similitude was to be made out he was at a loss to conceive; but he did see that if he proceeded in the measure proposed by the Government he might indeed vote that 15*s*. was equal to 1*l*. 1*s*. When he opposed the second reading of the Bill he declared that, if their Lordships should be of opinion that the Bill should be read a second time, and should go into Committee, he would enter that Committee with a sincere desire fairly and honestly to consider it, and with no party view, or wish, or intention, to destroy or annihilate it. To that declaration he adhered. He did not wish to destroy the Bill, but he wished to canvass its provisions honestly and fairly, and with a view to rendering the Bill as little injurious as, under all the circumstances, he could hope to see it rendered. The noble Earl, however, seemed not to be inclined to let any such course be followed. The noble Earl said, that the Motion, if adopted, would annihilate the Bill. He denied that it could, by possibility, have any such effect, unless the noble Earl, afraid of his own creation, wished to shrink from the Bill. If the noble Earl sincerely wished to forward the Bill, he could assure him that the Motion of his noble and learned friend was well calculated to effect that object: enfranchise as far as necessary first, and then disfranchise as far as necessary: that was the reasonable and proper course. If the enfranchisement proposed by the Bill was necessary, then the disfranchisement must, of course, follow. By taking the course proposed, therefore, the noble Earl would take the best possible course for securing the passing of the whole of the first clause. They were told that the great principle of the measuse was, the taking away of the inconsiderable boroughs from the representation. Which were the inconsiderable boroughs? How were they to know them? In the first Bill, both schedules A and B were very different from what they were at present. Those who had discussed the subject in the Cabinet continually differed, and if they were frequently changing their minds, how could it be supposed that those of their Lordships who had now come to deal with the subject for the first time, should be able, at once, to vote that fifty-six boroughs were inconsiderable? ["No, no."] What did noble Lords mean? Did they object to the particular way in which he put the case? The noble Earl would put the fifty-five boroughs *seriatim*, and then he would put the fifty-six, and upon each and all he would tell their Lordships that they were dealing with the principle of the Bill, and there must be no alteration. He, therefore, repeated his assertion, and he was astonished that it should be objected to, after noble Lords on the other side had protested against the form of words being objected to. But, was there any thing novel or extraordinary in the proposition of his noble and learned friend? No such thing: it was in strict accordance with the plan of proceeding proposed by all former Reformers, and by the noble Earl among the rest, and it should certainly have his support. But the noble Earl now said, that so to proceed would be to annihilate the Bill—that disfranchisement must go before enfranchisement—that the effect must precede the cause. Still he was of opinion the effect ought to follow the cause, and that, therefore, the enfranchisement ought to go before the disfranchisement. Then the noble Earl was willing enough that they should examine the Bill, amend, and alter it. But, said the noble Earl, you must not touch the disfranchising clauses, the enfranchising clauses, or the qualification clauses. Why, then, for what had they gone into Committee? If all the important points of the Bill were to be held inviolate, what were they in Committee for? It was like an Attorney, after a man had quarrelled with him respecting his Bill of costs, saying, "Oh, you may tax my bill, you may examine it, you may alter the details, but you must not attack, alter, or change the pounds, shillings, and pence, for if you do either alter or change them you will annihilate my Bill." If he believed that, in voting for the proposition of his noble and learned friend, he should take a step likely to destroy the Bill, he would not do so. He deplored greatly that the Bill had ever been brought forward, and he viewed the situation in which the country was placed with deep regret and alarm, but he would disdain to defeat the measure by any trick, or unworthy or dishonourable means. He had always pursued one line of conduct on questions of Reform, and that conduct was consistent with the vote he should give that night. Even after he had, at great pains and with much labour, pursued a borough through repeated and habitual bribery, he had not proposed to disfranchise that borough, but to extend the franchise; and, when he did so, did the advocates of the present Bill call upon him to give up his Motion? No. He persevered in his Motion; but some thought he went too far; and those great Reformers, who were now ready to sweep away all kinds of existing franchises, left him to fight the battle by himself. The noble Earl spoke of this Bill being in consonance with the Constitution, in as far as it referred to the Representative part of the system. Why there was not a single franchise it would not alter. The sacred common law franchise it would destroy, and yet the Bill was not to be touched. To that he could not consent, but still less would he consent, by any trick, to defeat and destroy the measure. He repeated, that he deplored the situation in which the country was placed, but he would never consent, should such a thing be proposed, to have recourse to trickery to destroy the Bill. He was confident that no trick, no unfairness, was intended—or, if there were, it was intended by the noble Earl from a desire to slip out of the dilemma into which he had fallen, and to throw the blame upon those who were anxious, not to destroy the Bill, but to render it as little injurious as possible. He could not see upon what rational fair ground the proposition of his noble and learned friend could be objected to. He contended, that it was analogous to all previous proceedings, and that the course proposed by the noble Earl was in direct opposition to all previous and approved plans. If the proposition of his noble and learned friend was adopted, then, indeed, the country might be saved from revolution and from anarchy; but if the inverted plan of proceeding advocated by the noble Earl was followed, he feared the worst consequences. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Holland) had talked of a revolution in Committee, and derided the idea of a revolution of two years, but he would remind the noble Lord that there was a revolution of two years in the reign of Charles 1st, for there was an interval of years of angry discussion before that revolution was completed. Was there not a revolution of more than two years in the time of Louis 16th in France, as well as in other instances which might easily be enumerated. Though he disliked the Bill greatly, still he was prepared honestly and truly to redeem the pledge he had given on the second reading. He would enter upon the examination of the Bill with a sincere desire to give to the country such a measure as ought, and he believed would, satisfy it. He entreated the noble Earl to pause before he took another desperate plunge—and he entreated the country, too, to consider well the matter. In this spirit he had gone into Committee, and if, on the third reading, the Bill appeared in such a shape that, under all the circumstances, it was as good as he expected, it should receive no further opposition at his hands. More than that he did not think the noble Earl had a right to expect him to say, and in saying so much he was sincere and straightforward. Such was the course hitherto adopted, and he saw no reason for departing from it in the present instance. It had been said, that, by altering the Bill, they would cast a slur upon the House of Commons. He denied that assertion, and contended, that the Bill cast a slur upon, and did an injury to, the institutions of the country. He would not longer detain their Lordships than to express a hope that they would decide only upon mature and impartial deliberation, and to assure them that he should give his vote for the proposition of his noble and learned friend upon the purest and most conscientious grounds.

Earl *Manvers* said, he very rarely intruded upon their Lordships' attention, but he was anxious then to say a few words. He had listened most attentively to the arguments in favour of the Amendment, in the hope that they would furnish him with some reason for voting in support of it. He must say, however, that he could find none. He considered the maintenance of the first clause, the disfranchising clause, as essential to the existence of the Bill, and therefore he could not consent to any motion which went to endanger that clause. He had made great sacrifices to pursue his duty, but he would do so come what might.

Lord *Clifford* said, he had never before addressed their Lordships, but he could not believe that the House of Peers would be so unmindful of the voice of the people as to adopt the proposition of the noble and learned Lord. The noble Lord contended for the propriety of reposing confidence in the Government, as the noble Earl at the head of it had always acted consistently and upon known principles. It was necessary for a person in this country to be useful, to connect himself with some party, and, having done so, he ought not to differ from it, or to leave it on slight grounds. Therefore, those who supported the second reading ought now to give credit to the declaration of the noble Earl, that the proposition of the noble and learned Lord would destroy the Bill, and, doing so, they ought to reject it. He was not present, owing to domestic circumstances, at either the first or second reading of the Bill; but he would not then go into any remarks upon the principle or character of the measure: he would content himself with noticing one or two arguments which had been used in support of the Amendment. If the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) meant to say that the present Government ought to follow the example of the Government of 1806 and 1807, and throw up office, then he could understand the propriety of his remarks. In such a course there would be reason. But if the noble Earl meant to say, that the Government should submit to the proposition of the noble and learned Lord, he could see no reason in the assertion, unless, indeed, it could be maintained that the Government ought to take their measures from their opponents. He approved of the arrangement of the Bill, and he should support it. He contended that the House of Commons had dealt wisely with the Bill, and had not in any way interfered with any of the privileges or rights of the House of Peers.

The Committee divided on the Amendment: Contents 151; Not Contents 116—Majority in favour of the Amendment 35.

List of the CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Cumberland
His R. H. the Duke of Gloucester.

ARCHBISHOPS.

Armagh
Canterbury
York.

DUKES.

Beaufort
Buckingham
Dorset
Manchester
Newcastle
Northumberland
Rutland
Wellington.

MARQUISSES.

Abercorn
Ailesbury
Bath
Bristol
Bute
Camden
Cholmondeley
Exeter
Salisbury
Thomond
Tweeddale.

EARLS.

Abingdon
Aylesford
Bathurst
Beauchamp
Beverley

Bradford
Brownlow
Caledon
Carnarvon
Charleville
Dartmouth
Delawarr
Digby
Doncaster (Duke of Buccleuch)
Eldon
Elgin
Falmouth
Glengall
Graham (D. of Montrose)
Harewood
Harrowby
Home
Howe
Jersey
Leven and Melville
Limerick
Liverpool
Lonsdale
Lucan
Macclesfield
Malmesbury
Mansfield
Morton
Mount Edgecumbe
Norwich (D. of Gordon)
Orford
Plymouth
Powis
Rosslyn
Selkirk
Shaftesbury
Stamford
St. Germain's
Stradbroke
Talbot
Tankerville
Vane (M. of Londonderry)
Verulam
Waldegrave
Warwick
Westmorland
Wicklow
Winchilsea.

VISCOUNTS.

Arbuthnot
Beresford
Combermere
Gordon (E. of Aberdeen)
Gort
Maynard
Sidmouth
Strathallan
Sydney.

LORDS.

Arden
Bagot
Bayning
Bexley
Boston
Carbery
Carteret
Clanbrassill (Earl of Roden)
Clanwilliam (Earl of Clanwilliam)
Colville
Cowley
Dalhousie (Earl of Dalhousie)
De Dunstanville
De Roos
Douglas
Dufferin
Dynevor
Ellenborough
Farnborough
Feversham
Forester
Gage
Grantham
Grantley
Harris
Hopetoun (E. of Hopetoun)
Kenyon
Kerr (M. of Lothian)
Lyndhurst
Manners
Maryborough
Meldrum (E. of Aboyne)
Melrose (E. of Haddington)
Monson
Montagu
Oriel (Viscount Ferrard)
Penshurst (V. Strangford)
Ravensworth
Redesdale
Ribblesdale
Rolle
Saltoun
Seaford
Sheffield (E. of Sheffield)
Skelmersdale
Southampton
Stafford
Stuart de Rothsay
Tyrone (M. of Waterford)
Wallace
Walsingham
Wharncliffe
Wigan (Earl of Balcarras)
Willoughby de Broke
Wynford.

BISHOPS.

Bangor
Bristol
Carlisle
Exeter
Gloucester
Kilmore
Lichfield & Coventry
Llandaff
Lincoln
Oxford
Rochester
Salisbury
Worcester.

List of the NOT-CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Sussex.

DUKES.

Bedford
Brandon
Devonshire
Grafton
Norfolk
Richmond
Somerset
St. Alban's.

MARQUISSES.

Cleveland
Hastings
Lansdowne
Queensberry
Winchester.

EARLS.

Albemarle
Amherst
Burlington
Camperdown
Charlemont
Chichester
Clarendon
Cowper
Craven
Denbigh
Derby
Fife
Gosford
Grey
Hillsborough (Marquis of Downshire)

Huntingdon
Ilchester
Lichfield
Manvers
Minto
Morley
Mulgrave
Munster
Onslow
Oxford
Pomfret
Radnor
Romney
Suffolk.

VISCOUNTS.

Bolingbroke
Goderich
Granville
Hood
Leinster (D. of Leinster)

LORDS.

Alvanley
Auckland
Audley
Barham
Boyle (Earl of Cork)
Braybrooke
Brougham
Byron
Chaworth (E. of Meath)
Clements
Clifford
Clifton (E. of Darnley)
Cloncurry
Crewe
Dacre
Dinorben
Dover
Ducie
Dundas
Dunmore (E. of Dunmore)
Durham
Erskine
Fingall (Earl of Fingall)
Fisherwick (Marquess of Donegall)
Foley
Glenlyon
Gower
Granard (E. of Granard)
Hawke
Holland
Howard de Walden
Howard of Effingham
Howden
Kenlis (M. of Headfort)
Lilford
Ludlow (Earl of Ludlow)
Lynedoch
Lyttelton
Melbourne (Viscount Melbourne)
Mendip (Visc. Clifden)
Middleton
Montfort
Mostyn
Mount Eagle (Marq. of Sligo)
Napier
Oakley
Ormonde (Marquis of Ormonde)
Panmure
Petre
Poltimore
Ponsonby, of Imokilly
Rosebery (Earl of Rosebery)
Rossie (Lord Kinnaird)
Saye and Sele
Sefton (Earl of Sefton)
Selsey
Shannon
Sherborne
Somerhill (Marquis of Clanricarde)
Sondes
Stafford
Stourton
Suffield
Sundridge (D. of Argyll)
Templemore
Teynham
Vernon
Wellesley(M. Wellesley)
Wenlock.
Willoughby d' Eresby
Yarborough.

BISHOPS.

Chester
Chichester
London
St. David's.

Clause postponed.

Earl Grey moved the House should resume, that the Chairman should report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Thursday next.

Lord *Lyndhurst* hoped the noble Earl would permit him to propose the remaining motion of which he had given notice, namely, that the next clause be postponed.

Earl Grey would not offer any opposition to the Motion.

Question put, that the next clause be postponed.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that, to the Motion just proposed by the noble and learned Lord near him he could have no objection, nor indeed could their Lordships, for the vote which had just been taken in point of fact as much referred to the postponement of the clause which formed the subject-matter of the Motion then before them as it did to the preceding one. He had heard with great regret the intention which the noble Earl had announced of postponing the further consideration of the measure until Thursday next. Much had been said of the necessity of a speedy adjustment of the question of Reform, yet how did the noble Earl propose to act? He could assure both the noble Earl and their Lordships that, from the side of the House upon which he sat, there was no wish whatever to interpose any delay to the adjustment of the measure. If delay were chargeable against any persons on the part of those who were anxious that the measure before their Lordships should receive a full discussion, it was chargeable solely and directly against the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government. To that noble Earl it applied, and not to those noble Lords who concurred in the view of the measure taken by his noble and learned friend and which he had supported. For himself he much regretted that the motion which the noble Earl proposed to make should deprive him of the opportunity of explaining to their Lordships in detail, as he intended to have done at the meeting of the House, the next day, should it meet, the nature of those amendments which, after the fullest consultation and communication with his noble friends, it was his intention to propose to their Lordships' consideration. At the late hour to which the night had advanced he felt unable to go into those propositions in detail, and consistently with the respect which he entertained for their Lordships, he was unwilling to enter upon them at all unless he could explain them in a clear and most collected manner. However, the intimation which the noble Earl had given left him no alternative, and, even at the risk of being misunderstood and misinterpreted, he would briefly develop the nature of those alterations to which he should hereafter more particularly request their Lordships' attention. At present, then, he should merely state, that, having, in conjunction with others, most seriously considered the main principles of the Bill; having considered the various clauses by which enfranchisement and disfranchisement was to be effected; having considered the interests and the character of the several towns in schedules C and D; having well considered the change which under the circumstances in which the country was then placed, and the peculiar circumstances under which the Bill had been prepared and thus far carried towards completion—having well considered the change which under such circumstances would be effected by the giving additional Members to counties; having also strong objections to the schedules B and D, the result of the amendments which he should have proposed would have been to have given enfranchisement to an extent which would have rendered it necessary, unless the House had been prepared to extend the number of the Members of the House of Commons to a degree which would most materially interfere with its convenience and efficiency as a deliberative assembly to carry disfranchisement to the full extent of schedule A. To that schedule, and to the disfranchisement of Weymouth—that was to say, to the extinction of 113 Members as proposed in that part of the Bill—he should not object; but to the subsequent provisions of the Bill he had, as he had already stated, many amendments to move. He was sorry to have been obliged, by the conduct of the noble Earl, to state thus much without, at the same time, stating in detail the reasons which induced him to oppose the other schedules to which he had shortly alluded. There was one other important feature of the Bill which he had not yet mentioned, but upon which he must be allowed to say a very few words, he meant the 10*l.* qualification. To that qualification, as a uniform qualification, he had at a late period, stated his most decided objection; he stated, that he objected to it, not because it was popular, but because it was uniform; and he also stated his deep regret that the measure proposed almost necessarily excluded from direct Representation all the poorest classes of the community. He thought that in the progress of the measure, it would be a matter of the most serious consideration to their Lordships whether it might not be expedient and necessary, with a view to the permanence of the measure, to continue in places where it at present existed the more popular mode of voting, which allowed to every man who paid scot-and-lot the privilege of electing Members of Parliament. It was true that that mode of voting was for a short period to be continued—at least existing votes were to be preserved; but he (Lord Ellenborough) did not believe it possible that any constituency could exist for any great length of time, from which all the poorer classes were excluded. There was this great advantage in the ancient system, which it was now proposed to overthrow, that while, on the one hand, it gave direct Representation to property and wealth, without exciting popular passion and popular jealousy, so, on the other, without leading to danger from democratic influence, it gave direct Representation to the very lowest contributors to rates and taxes. He now threw it out to the serious consideration of the House, whether it would be safe, perspectively, to disfranchise all the poorest class of voters and to establish one uniform qualification? With respect to another portion of the Bill, if the opportunity were afforded him, he should have proposed an amendment, which he apprehended would not have received any considerable opposition even from the noble Lords opposite. He referred to an amendment by which persons would not be allowed to vote for counties in consideration of property situated in boroughs. He repeated his regret that he had been obliged, in that imperfect and very hasty manner, to state the amendments which it was his intention to have proposed had the business of the Committee been allowed to proceed in the manner that was anticipated. He had nearly forgotten to state that, with respect to the 10*l.* qualification, it had occurred to him, as he apprehended it must have occurred to all who had attentively considered that provision of the Bill, that there ought to be some more clear and more certain mode of ascertaining the genuineness and reality of that qualification than was at present laid down. It was his intention, therefore, to propose some amendment, which should have the effect of ensuring the genuineness and reality of the 10*l.* qualification whenever it should be made to confer the right of voting.

The Duke of *Buckingham* begged to make one remark, namely, that, with regard to the 10*l.* clause he could not go along with the noble Baron who had just spoken. Before he sat down he desired to express a hope that the noble Earl (Earl Grey), after the consideration which it was to be presumed he had given the measure of Reform, saw the necessity of enlarging the 10*l.* qualification in different districts.

Earl *Grey* said, it was not his intention at that late hour of the night to enter into a consideration of the plan of Reform which the noble Baron had just proposed. He could not, however, refrain from congratulating him and the House in the progress which he had made, and the extent to which he then found himself ready to proceed upon the revolutionary measure, as it was termed, which his Majesty's Ministers had introduced. The noble Baron, it appeared, was prepared to admit disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and an extensive popular qualification; nay, even more extensive than the qualification proposed in the Bill, because the noble Baron professed an intention not to touch the 10*l.* qualification, but to preserve that more extensive right of scot-and-lot franchise in all those places where it then existed. The noble Baron objected to the uniformity of the 10*l.* qualification as being, as he and others had denounced it to be, democratic and revolutionary, and he proposed to correct it—how? by retaining a portion of the existing system, which was more extensive and more democratic. It was not for him to speak of the consistency of the noble Baron, or of the plan of Reform which the noble Baron was prepared to concede; but he must congratulate him on the proof which he had given in the suggestion which he adopted from the noble Baron at the Table, of there being no concert between noble Lords on the other side. Recurring to what had been said of a noble Earl opposite, he could not but regret that some communication had not been made with respect to the course which the noble Lords who opposed the measure intended to pursue, or of the views which they had adopted. Certainly that was the first time that he had heard of any disposition to make the concessions of which they had just heard. He did not say, that he had a right to complain of no communication having been made to him; but he thought that he had a right to complain, on the part of the House, that the intentions of the noble Baron were not explained before the vote which had just been carried were taken. He should like to know what many, who concurred in that vote, particularly the noble Duke opposite, would have said if the noble Baron's intentions had been explained? It was not, however, his intention to go into any discussion of the matters to which the noble Baron had adverted on that occasion. They would come to be considered hereafter. He understood that to the principle of disfranchisement to the extent of schedule A, the noble Baron had no objection. If that were so he certainly thought it unfortunate that the noble Baron should have raised a difficulty in the way of carrying into effect his own purpose by proposing the postponement of that clause. But, if he were not mistaken, the noble Baron, although prepared to assent to schedule A, would proceed to abolish entirely schedules B and D. To such a proposition it was impossible for him to consent. He trusted that the House would concur with him, seeing the necessity which had arisen for doing so, in deferring the further proceedings of the Committee until Thursday next. As to the charge of delay which the noble Baron was anxious to fix upon him, he (Earl Grey) could only say that, under the circumstances of the case, he should be perfectly ready to run the risk of incurring such a charge, being convinced that there was no man in the country who would not think him justified, after what had occurred, in proposing an adjournment of two days.

Clause postponed House resumed, to sit again on Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, May 7, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Mr. EWART, from Liverpool, for a Revision of the Criminal Code, as relating to Crimes against Property.—By Mr. E. J. LITTLETON, from Burslem, Shelton, and Harley, for the Abolition of Tithes.—By Mr. SANFORD, from the Throwsters and Manufacturers interested in Silk Mills in the Counties of Dorset and Somerset, for exempting the Silk Trade from the Operation of the Factories Regulation Bill; also from Trent in (Ireland), against the New System of Education.

SALE OF BEER.] Mr. *Littleton* had to present Petitions for the amendment of the Sale of Beer Act from Cheadle, Harley, and Shelton. The petitioners prayed that, the Act might be amended in the part which related to beer consumed on the premises; and that beer might be sold for a limited period only on Sundays, and that the licensing of persons of this description should be limited to those whose rental was 10*l.* per annum; and that such houses should be immediately under the control of the Magistracy. He did not agree with the whole prayer of the petition, but with that part of it which referred to the limitation to houses of 10*l.* a-year, and to these houses being in some measure under the control of the Magistracy. He would admit that it was in opposition to his general ideas of the propriety of free trade that he supported the prayer of the petitions, believing that in this instance particular care was necessary to prevent an abuse of the law.

Mr. *Hume* could not tell how to reconcile the support of a free-trade system with the advocacy of restrictive measures. He thought that the Magistracy had a strong hankering after a similar monopoly in the licensing of beer shops that they enjoyed over that of the public-houses, but he thought, any further legislative interference was wholly unnecessary, at least, until the present system had had more time afforded to it. Up to the present moment there had, reckoning from the commencement of the operations under the Beer Bill, been a constant decrease in the number of beer shops; from several places he had received an account of the decrease, which reduction he found to be in the proportion of thirty to twelve or thirteen, nearly two-thirds of the number originally opened. He knew not why the poor man should not have the same facility afforded to him for the purchase of his glass of beer, as the rich man for his glass of port; and, he hoped, that more time would be afforded for the fair working of the measure, before any alteration in the present law should take place.

Mr. *Trevor* agreed with the petitioners as to the evils resulting to the poorer classes of the people from the passing of this measure, although he was not prepared to say in what manner those evils might be remedied. The hon. member for Staffordshire might, with very little trouble, have satisfied himself as to the state of these beer houses, the evils of which were a subject of complaint throughout the country. He had received communications from various quarters, all complaining of these evils, and some restraint ought to be imposed.

Mr. *John Wood* believed that in nine cases out of ten in which these evils had occurred, they had arisen from beer houses being compelled to shut up at an earlier hour than public houses. Why should a person be allowed to drink at a public house and be denied that privilege at a beer house? He thought with his hon. friend the member for Middlesex, that there should be no restriction, for the number of these houses, would of itself diminish the imposing of any restrictions on the enjoyments of the industrious classes of the people.

Mr. *Sanford* said, much evil had arisen from the indiscriminate manner in which these licenses were granted, to check which some restraints were necessary. Complaints were made from every part of the country of the demoralization of the lower classes of the people, and of the great increase of crime since the passing of this measure. There might be, and no doubt had been cases where the power of licensing had been abused, but it was very hard to say that the country magistrates complained of these evils because they wanted additional powers. They viewed with regret the extreme demoralization of the poorer classes; and witnessing this, and the way in which the poorer classes spent their money in these beer houses, instead of carrying it home for the support of their families, the Magistrates, and others, felt it their duty to state these circumstances. Much good would arise from fixing a rate below which houses should not be licensed.

Mr. *Fysche Palmer* confirmed the account of the hon. member for Middlesex, as to the decrease of these beer shops, the proprietors of which, not finding it answer their purpose, had been compelled in many instances, to close them. There was a general cry against these beer shops, without much justification. Up to the present moment time had not been allowed to ascertain the benefits or evils arising from the measure: it was too much to expect that a system which had been in operation only two years should be perfect; the evils with which it was charged, would, he believed, cure themselves in a little time.

Petitions to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION (IRELAND).] Colonel *Lindsay* presented a Petition from the provincial Synod of Fife, against the Ministerial Plan of Education in Ireland. The hon. Member said, that this petition was entitled to the most serious attention of the House, as it was signed by seventy-three clergymen of the Established Church of Scotland, and by as many Elders; and they prayed that no legislative enactment might pass, or that no grant should be given, for the purpose of promoting any education in Ireland which was not founded upon the Bible. It was but rarely that the clergy of Scotland interfered in political subjects, and the House might therefore, well suppose that nothing but a sense of duty could bring them forward on this occasion. He had great satisfaction in presenting this petition which completely coincided with his own opinions. He did not support this petition from any feeling of intolerance, which neither he nor the clergy had ever entertained. He was for giving the fullest toleration, but there was a great difference between toleration and encouragement. He could not avoid saying that the constitution of the Irish Board was such as to excite the greatest jealousy amongst the clergy of Scotland, and he must say that he partook of such jealousy. The Board was composed of persons of different sects, and these had an interest in preventing the use of any books which might be inconsistent with their respective creed; now this was a power which certainly ought not to have been granted, particularly to Roman Catholics. He knew it was desirable to give a literary and moral education to the Irish, but then he could not allow any system in which morality was separated from religion, which was the true basis of all morality. This, however, was proposed by the Government, who were to exclude the Bible from schools during four days of the week, and the House by sanctioning the plan of Government, were effectually giving their aid to the separation of religion from morality. He believed the fact to be, that the Government had found it convenient to concede to the Roman Catholics, and this was an additional cause for jealousy. There had been already too many concessions. They had passed the Catholic Relief Bill. They had passed the Test and Corporation Acts; they now were proceeding to the extinction of tithes, a word which as soon as it was announced, rung from one quarter of the country to the other; and the extinction was determined upon before any measure for the relief of the Irish clergy had been passed. He was sure that the proposed system would have the worst effect, and he was sorry that it had ever been adopted, as he felt satisfied it would be a most disastrous blow to the Protestant education in Ireland.

Mr. *Robert Dundas* said, he had been called upon to support the prayer of this petition, and he had great pleasure in doing so, as he could bear testimony to the respectability and high intelligence of the petitioners. The clergymen who signed that petition were men of great talents, and great moral worth, and were entitled to have their opinions attentively weighed by the House. He should not then enter more fully into this subject, but should merely say that the opinions of the petitioners were those of the great majority of the clergymen of the Established Church of Scotland. He still hoped that Government would adopt some plan less objectionable with respect to education in Ireland.

Mr. *Hume* had not intended to have said a word, but he felt called upon to give a decided contradiction to the assertion that the majority of the Church of Scotland were opposed to the Government plan of education. He could take upon himself to say that such was not the case: and in confirmation of his opinion he would merely refer to the only open meeting which had been held in Scotland on the subject. At the meeting in Glasgow there was a majority of five to one against the opposers of the Government plan of education; and he was sure a similar result would await any like public attempt in Scotland. This was a case in which he thought the clergy of Scotland ought to remain neuter; or, if they did interfere at all, it ought not to be to promote any monopoly of education. The Catholics of Ireland had as good a right to education as the Protestants of England, or the Presbyterians of Scotland; and they had also as good a right to be educated in their own way.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* supported this petition, which was sanctioned by the signatures of seventy-five clergymen of the Church of Scotland, and as many lay elders. It was a petition which appealed to the heart of every Scotch Member—it recalled to their remembrance that period in the history of their country of which they might well be proud—it reminded them of the struggles made by their ancestors in support of their religion, and was a question which embodied everything which was good and great as attached to the name of Scotchman. The hon. Gentleman who presented this petition said, that the clergy of the Church of Scotland seldom interfered with temporal affairs; but he would impress it on the consideration of the House that this was not such a question—it was one embodying spiritual matters, on which it was their duty, as it was their inclination, to come forward and express an opinion. With respect to what had fallen from the hon. member for Middlesex, was the House to understand, that the knowledge of the clergy of the Church of Scotland, on the subject of education, was not to be put in competition with that possessed by members of Political Unions, who thrust themselves forward and said that they were the only judges on the subject of education, and that, on this, the clergy knew nothing? As he had several petitions, of a similar tenor to the one before the House, to be presented at a future day, he would, for the present, refrain from saying more on this subject.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the hon. Members who supported the petition had taken upon themselves to eulogize the talents and learning of the clerical personages who signed the petition, but these hon. Members should recollect that there were also great talents and learning amongst the respectable body alluded to by his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex. At the head of that meeting was Sir Daniel Sandford, the Greek professor of the University of Glasgow. A more powerful and rational speech than that of Sir Daniel Sandford's never was delivered. What a contrast did it form to the vulgar bigotry which marked the lucubrations of those who opposed the Government plan of education! The hon. Member (Mr. James E. Gordon), in the plenitude of his kindness, had talked of his disposition to extend toleration to the Catholics of Ireland. She did not want the toleration of the hon. Member. The pride of the Irish Catholics was, to stand upon a level with all other denominations of Christians in the empire, and neither to seek nor require toleration from any of them. The petition which had been presented was a most bigotted and intolerant production. All the meetings which had been held, and the speeches which were delivered, against the Irish Board of Education, were a tissue of the most gross and disgusting cant and hypocrisy. He would cast no imputation on hon. Members, but on every occasion, whenever the subject was introduced, either in that House or out of it, he would denounce this as a factious and bigotted opposition. An honorable Member stated, that the Catholics dictated to the New Board of Education; but only two Catholics belonged to that Board; and by what species of logic would the hon. Member undertake to prove that two persons could dictate to seven? The present plan of education was not framed by Catholics. It was a measure brought forward by the Government on their own responsibility, and it was supported by the Catholics because they considered it a good one. The Catholics were anxious that Protestant and Catholic children should be educated together, but they did not desire to force any system of education on the Protestants of Ireland. An allusion had been made to Emancipation. It had been asserted that the measure effected no good in Ireland. He would tell the hon. Member that Emancipation had been productive of the most salutary results. Parties who had been opposed to each other were now united in the closest bonds of amity, and the only class of persons who endeavoured to keep up dissensions were those who acted from the basest and most interested motives. The Government plan of education proposed to devote two days in the week to religious instruction, and four to literary instruction: it did not interfere with any schools but those which were carried on under their direction. Each party would be instructed by clergymen of their own persuasion, in separate apartments; and all the books employed in the schools were to be selected and arranged by the Managing Board. Many of the objections to this plan came with a very bad grace from those who had supported the Kildare-street Society, which had gone so far as to allow the use of Catholic versions of the Scriptures. Hitherto religion had been prostituted in Ireland, under the plea of supporting a peculiar system of education. What state of society must that be, in which it was necessary for the landlord to consult his clergyman as to what schools he had better counsel his tenant to send his children? If any Protestant could prove that he had ever been interfered with as to the education of his children, he would join him most sincerely in trying to remove so intolerable a nuisance; and he demanded the same freedom from interference for the Catholics of Ireland. The present opposition was resorted to because the measure had been brought forward by a Reforming Government. If hon. Members who declaimed so loudly in favour of liberty of conscience—if they would now take up a case which had been alluded to before in that House, but which had never been followed up—he alluded to the case of two officers belonging to the British service in the island of Malta, who had been dismissed from the army because they refused, from conscientious motives, to bow before the procession of the sacrament in that island: if that case was brought forward, he pledged himself that it should have his support.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, he had once brought this very subject forward, and he was supported by the hon. and learned Member—a circumstance which that hon. and learned Member had forgotten. The language of that hon. Member was scarcely Parliamentary, and such as he would not have addressed to any body of gentlemen out of the House, in speaking of canting hypocrisy.

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that he alluded to the canting hypocrisy out of the House.

Sir *Robert Inglis* would leave the hon. Member to settle that with the parties to whom he had alluded, as he best could; but it could not be supposed those Members who advocated petitions like the present could be made answerable for all that parties said out of the House. Did the hon. Member mean that the numerous petitions presented against the measure within the last few months, were to be designated as founded on the rankest hypocrisy and cant? It was most surprising to hear hon. Gentlemen say, that these seventy clergymen who had affixed their names to this petition, had been influenced by feelings of bigotry. He could not see how, in candour, or according to parliamentary usages, this charge could be brought against those, who were opposed to the present plan of education in Ireland. The supporters of it were indeed equally liable to such charges, and to have motives imputed to them. It was painful to those who held the opinion of these seventy clergymen, to hear the observations of the hon. members for Middlesex and Kerry, and he could not let them pass without making one or two observations in reply. It was a sense of duty alone which induced these rev. gentlemen to petition the House, and it was highly improper to impute personal motives to them. The hon. member for Kerry said, that the Emancipation Bill had produced conciliation between Protestants and Catholics. But the party in Ireland, which called out so loudly for conciliation, never would be satisfied until all the Protestants were driven from that country. Then, indeed, the population might be of one heart and mind, *ubi solitudinem facis*—then only could the hon. Member talk of general conciliation.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* said, from his knowledge of the character of the clergy of the Church of Scotland, he had no doubt of the respectability of the petitioners; he would, however, make one observation on what fell from the hon. member for Edinburgh. The hon. Gentleman stated, that there was an universal feeling against this system of education among the clergy of Scotland. This he denied. Many clergymen were, doubtless, opposed to it, but the majority were not, and many of the most respectable and learned members of that body were divided in their approbation of it. An hon. friend of his had a petition, similar to the one now before the House, to present from the Synod of Galloway. He (Mr. Cutlar Fergusson) had received a letter from a clergyman in that district, informing him that the petition was only carried by the casting voice of the moderator. His informant was the rev. Mr. Jeffries, and he stated that he proposed an amendment to the petition, which was lost by one only. This, at least, showed, that the feeling was not universal against the system. It was stated, that the plan of Government excluded the use of the Scriptures. Instead of this, the Protestant children had the use of the whole of the Scriptures for two days, and for the remainder of the week they used, in common with the Catholic children, select extracts from the Scriptures, approved by the clergy of both creeds. It appeared to him that, if there was any objection to this plan, it was the circumstance of making the Scriptures almost a common school-book. This was not calculated to increase a reverence for the Bible in the minds of the children.

Petition to be printed.

Breach of Privilege.] On the Motion of Lord Stormont, Mr. Reid, the printer of the handbill in which the names of the majority and minority of the Committee of the House of Commons which sat upon the Sunderland Dock Bill were published, was called to the Bar. He said, he printed the bill by direction of a majority of a committee of persons in Sunderland interested in the Bill. He took the list of names from a letter signed by Wright and Kidson, the solicitors for the Bill.

These gentlemen, were then, on the Motion of Lord Stormont, called to the Bar, and acknowledged the writing of the letter. They were not aware that in so doing they were committing a Breach of Privilege, and expressed their sincere regret that they had inadvertently done so.

On the Motion of Lord Stormont the House voted the letter written by the Solicitors, in which the names of the majority and minority of the Committee were published, to be a Breach of Privilege.

Lord Stormont moved, that the Solicitors should be called to the Bar, which was accordingly done.

Mr. Beaumont moved that Mr. Kidson and Mr. Wright, the explanations which they had given and the apologies which they made being deemed sufficient, be discharged, and that the House do not think it necessary to proceed any further in the business.

Mr. John Campbell supported the Motion.

Sir *Robert Peel* hoped that Mr. Kidson and Mr. Wright would be discharged without punishment; but he thought they should receive, through the organ of the House, such a reprimand as their great offence merited; and they should be told that, had it not been for their personal explanations, the House would have punished them severely. Their offence was a great one. To charge a Committee of that House with being influenced by corrupt motives in the discharge of their official duties was a very serious offence. It had been said, that the letter which was written, and which constituted the offence, was written confidentially, and which stated that the Bill had been defeated through a corrupt family connection. That letter was written for the purpose of being shown to more than 100 persons, who were interested in the Bill; therefore, he thought that circumstance deprived it of its confidential character. Moreover, it was written with the intention of publication, and such being the case, he was of opinion that a very great offence had been committed; yet, after the explanations which had been given, and the apologies which had been made, he hoped that the House would agree with him in thinking a reprimand would be deemed a sufficient punishment.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought a reprimand a very severe punishment, and that it should not be inflicted except upon very important occasions. It was beneath the dignity of the House to do so. He thought that, after the great sorrow which had been expressed by Mr. Kidson and Mr. Wright, the Motion of the hon. member for Northumberland would meet the justice of the case. For his part, he would give it his most cordial support.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that he had made a technical mistake. He had just understood that, before a reprimand could be given by the organ of the House, it was necessary that the parties should be in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and, therefore, he would move that the word "admonition" be substituted for "reprimand."

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, that it was inconsistent with the dignity of the House not to punish most severely the Breach of Privilege which had been committed, at least by the severest reprimand.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* conceived that it was the bounden duty of the House to visit the present offence with a very severe punishment.

Lord *Althorp* thought it was the duty of the House to inflict punishment in serious cases, yet, in the present one, he thought that, after the apologies which had been made at the Bar, the House would deem an admonition sufficient.

Sir *George Cockburn*, though a Member of the Committee which had been alluded to, felt nothing personal towards Mr. Kidson and Mr. Wright; yet he was sure, had any hon. Member been present, he would see how unjust it was to impute improper motives to that Committee, and how perfectly false the charges were which had been made against them. He perfectly concurred in the Motion of the right hon. Member in the substitution of the word "admonition" for "reprimand."

Mr. *Hunt* thought the present offence was slight to that which had often been committed by the hon. member for Kerry, who called the House, which represented the majesty of the people, the nominees of the borough-mongers; therefore, he hoped, in the present instance, the slightest possible punishment would be inflicted.

It was then

"Resolved—That the letter addressed to the Committee of Wet Docks, Sunderland, signed John P. Kidson and Joseph John Wright, contains libellous matter, reflecting on the Committee of this House, to whom the Sunderland Docks Bill was referred, in Breach of the Privileges of this House.

"Resolved—That John P. Kidson and Joseph John Wright, in having written the said letter to the Committee of Wet Docks Sunderland, have been guilty of a high Breach of the Privileges of this House.

"Ordered—That John P. Kidson and Joseph John Wright be called to the Bar of this House, and there admonished by Mr. Speaker."

Mr. Kidson and Mr. Wright were again called to the Bar, and were thus addressed by Mr. Speaker:—

"Mr. John Kidson and Mr. Joseph Wright, the House have taken into their consideration the letter upon which you have been examined. It was impossible for them to entertain a doubt that it contains a grave Breach of the Privileges of this House; and, if it had been unaccompanied by the explanations which both of you have afforded, and by the regret which you have expressed, the House would have felt it due to themselves and to the public to have taken the most serious notice of it; but they have been struck with the candour with which you have stated your own conduct; they have been induced to believe that the earnestness and zeal that you felt in the interests of your clients led you unpremeditatedly to the commission of this Breach of Privilege; and, under these circumstances, they feel that their own honour and dignity may be preserved, and that the public interests will not be compromised, by their consenting to go no further than to direct me, as their Speaker, to admonish you as to your future conduct; that admonition, they feel persuaded, will preclude a repetition of such offence, and relieve them from the painful task of considering its enormity."

BLOCKADE OF MADEIRA.] Lord *Eliot* begged to repeat a question he had put before the recess to the noble Lord opposite, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He wished to know whether any information with respect to the blockade of the island of Madeira had reached the noble Lord; and if so, he hoped the noble Lord would have no objection to communicate it to the House. The questions he would put to the noble Lord were—first, by whom the blockade was notified to him; and, secondly, in whose name it was carried on. It was said on one hand to be carried on by her most faithful Majesty, and on the other it was more generally believed to be carried on by the Regency of Terceira, as two vessels were in the blockading squadron bearing the colours of the Regency. It was also asserted that the squadron was commanded by British officers, and manned by British seamen. He also wished to know what information the noble Lord opposite had received on that point.

Viscount *Palmerston* said, that he could only give the same answer to the noble Lord as he had addressed to Lloyd's on the subject. The blockade was carried on in the name of her most faithful Majesty Donna Maria, queen of Portugal, who was competent to institute such a blockade. With respect to the question on the subject of the squadron being commanded and manned by British officers and seamen, he was unable to give any information, further than that the officer commanding was an Englishman, who had formerly served as a midshipman in the British navy, but who was now entirely unconnected with that service.

Lord *Eliot* begged again to inquire from whom the information of the blockade was received.

Viscount *Palmerston* said, that the information received had been sent by the Admiral to the British Consul on the island, and it was by the British Consul forwarded to this country.

CORONERS' BILL.] Mr. Cripps moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Coroners' Bill.

Mr. *John Campbell* conceived that further proceedings with the Bill ought, for the present, to be postponed.

Mr. *Godson* concurred with the hon. member for Stafford, and thought the Bill ought to be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. *Hunt* opposed the Bill, and expressed his determination to divide the House on the Motion.

House divided: Ayes 34; Noes 2—Majority 32.

House in Committee, and, on the Motion of Mr. Hunt, counted out.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Tuesday, May 8, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Duke of RICHMOND, from the Lewis Bundle of Sticks Society;—by the Marquis of CLEVELAND, from the Freemen of the Seven Incorporated Trades of Dumfries;—by Lord KING, from Clonnoulty and Rossmore,—in favour of Parliamentary Reform.—By the Earl of HAREWOOD, from Northallerton, that that Place might be substituted for York as the Place for holding, in future, the Elections for the North Riding of Yorkshire.—By Lord KING, from Dumfries;—and by the Duke of DEVONSHIRE, from Derby,—in favour of Education (Ireland) Bill.—By the Earl of RODEN, from Kilnagross;—by the Earl of ABERDEEN, from the Presbytery of Aberdeen;—by a NOBLE LORD, from the Synod of Galloway;—and by the Duke of WELLINGTON, from Norwich,—against the Bill.—By Lord KING, from Kilconley, Kilbannon, Crossboyne, Kilvine, Armagh, and Tagheen; from Lanesborough; from the Tithe-Payers of the Barony of Bargy; the Inhabitants of Clondalkin, Lukan, Palmerstown, Shrule, Loughmore; and from the Political Union of Waterford; from the Inhabitants of Mallyfarnham, Leany, and Lacken,—for the Abolition of Tithes, and the Repeal of the Vestry Laws;—from the Inhabitants of Leapatrick, expressing their satisfaction that Tithes are to be Abolished in Ireland, and praying the House to pass the English Reform Bill as speedily as possible.—By Lord DACRE, from the Inhabitants of Hemel, Hempstead, and St. Alban's, for the immediate Abolition of Negro Slavery; and from Shipsea and Beaford, in favour of the Bill for Ameliorating the Condition of the Agricultural Poor; and also for speedily passing the Bill to Regulate the Hours of Employing Children in Factories:—By Lord KING, from the Inhabitants of Newtownsmith, to be heard by Council against the Indemnity Bill; and from Tullamore, Clara, and Maale, for a Revision of the Criminal Law.—By the Bishop of BRISTOL, from the Society against Cruelty to Animals of Saffron Walden, for devising such Regulations as will prevent unnecessary Cruelty.

ARREARS OF TITHES (IRELAND).] Viscount Melbourne proposed that the Committee on the Irish Tithe Bill should be postponed till Thursday.

The Archbishop of *Armagh* said, my Lords as the Bill before your Lordships was read a second time at so late an hour that I was unable to make any observations upon it, I must request your Lordships' permission to state the view which is taken of it by myself, and I believe I may say by the Irish branch of the united church. I am anxious to declare that I regard it as a seasonable, necessary, and I may add, just measure of relief to the sufferings of an unoffending, meritorious, and most loyal class of his Majesty's subjects—themselves the steady advocates of peace and good order, but now the victims of unprovoked outrage and general insubordination. Whatever the original impolicy may have been or the alleged grievance, whether real or imaginary, and in my conscience I believe it is more fictitious and imaginary than real, put forward rather for factious than religious purposes—but I say whatever may have been the original impolicy of the ancient provision for the clergy, they are not chargeable with any of the evils which arise out of this species of property. Their title to it is as unquestionable as that by which your Lordships hold your own estates. If that title be disputed let the opposite claim be made good before the legal tribunals of the country, and we are content to abide by their decision, but until such a decision is obtained, we may well expect from your Lordships' justice, that the private opinions and gratuitous assumptions of interested individuals will not be sufficient to disturb rights founded upon ancient grants recognised by express statutes, and devised as an undoubted part of the common law, and the established practice of the land. If bold assertion, unsupported by any show of authority, be sufficient to shake the property of the Church—if such sophistry as that which was used before the Committee be countenanced, or even heard with complacency in this House—if its motives and its tendency be not seen through and justly estimated—nay, if it be not repelled by your Lordships with suitable indignation and scorn—I shall lament, not only for the inevitable destruction of the rights of my own order, but much more for that blindness and infatuation which are unable to discover that by the same or similar pretences of factious and artful men, the foundations of all property, lay as well as ecclesiastical, and the stability of all rights will be speedily subverted, and public security involved in one common ruin. I trust, my Lords, that I am not going out of my way in thus asserting the rights of the clergy to the property of tithe, because it is only on the validity of those rights that the measure of relief proposed by this Bill can be supported—or that they wish it to be supported. Their just and legal claims have been defeated by means of illegal combination, and in consequence of a disorganised state of society, provoked by no exorbitancy of demand on their part, and by no injudicious severity in the mode of enforcing that demand, but by a system of continued agitation, and by the artful suggestion of those from whose spiritual character less pernicious counsels might have been expected. Instead of one-tenth of the produce subject to the payment of which your Lordships hold, and all others have purchased their titheable property—the calumniated clergy of Ireland have been contented to receive less than a fifteenth of the rent, or from a fiftieth to a sixtieth part of the produce. This has been satisfactorily proved by a variety of witnesses before the Committee of your Lordships' House, and it is confirmed by the compositions already entered into by more than 1,500 of the parishes in Ireland—the amount of which averages less than 1*s*. per English acre. Such is that grievous impost on the industry and agricultural improvement of Ireland to which it has been said its poverty and its distractions are to be attributed. But, my Lords, small as this sum may appear in amount, it may be thought that the mode of collecting it has been vexatious. I do not deny that in a few instances which the industry of our opponents may have raked out, causes of complaint may have arisen, but these are generally to be traced not to the incumbent himself but to those to whom he has been compelled, by the refractoriness of the people, to commit the collection of his tithes. This, however, is never done without serious loss of income to the incumbent himself. In all cases in which no perverse opposition is given it is manifestly the incumbent's interest to enter into a moderate and amicable arrangement with his parishioners—both for the amount and the mode of collecting his tithes. And the best proof of his willingness to do this is to be found in the terms of the compositions already entered into, in which the clergyman has been generally willing to take not only far less than his legal demand—more he cannot take—but far less than his customary receipts, and which, although he is authorised to demand payment twice a-year, as in case of rent, he generally applies for it only once—at the time most convenient for the people to pay it, and not unfrequently a year after it is due. But, my Lords, this may not be the most fitting occasion for vindicating the moderation and forbearance of the Irish clergy both as to the amount of their demands, and as to the mode of enforcing them—since their conduct will be seen in the evidence already laid upon your Lordships' Table. To your Lordships' candour and justice I fearlessly commit their case, and not only to your Lordships judgment, but to that of an impartial and discriminating public. With respect to the sufferings of the clergy of the disturbed districts, amounting, I fear, to the utter ruin of many, and the great embarrassment of all, I must say a few words. I hold in my hand letters which fully justify me in stating that men brought up in decent and easy circumstances have been suddenly reduced to the greatest privations—and in some cases their families would have suffered under absolute want, had they not been relieved by the charitable aid of their friends and brethren. I could mention the names of the sufferers, and of their generous benefactors, if it were necessary. Others have been driven from their homes by threats which were too certain of being executed—and those who have had the courage to remain have been obliged, at serious expense, to send away their families to places of greater security. If it be asked why did not the clergy seek that timely assistance from the Government which they professed themselves ready to afford, and thus prevent the growth of this now extended mischief? I will tell your Lordships from conversations which I have had with many of the sufferers. The direct application to Government for military aid was the last remedy to which they chose to resort. Many of the ruined clergy have told me that, rather than risk the shedding of blood they would prefer the abandonment of their claims, however disastrous the consequences might be to themselves and families. In some instances the early interposition of Government produced the desired effect of bringing back the people to a sense of their duty, and I am bound to say, that if it had been more generally sought for and afforded, it would have produced the same effect in all. But I believe the fact to be, that the Government was unequal to afford the requisite assistance in the numerous and harassing cases in which it might have been called for—and the clergy still cling to the hope of the general enforcement of the ordinary, or the enactment of some extraordinary, law by which peace and good order may be restored, and their rights established, without being made themselves the objects of popular indignation and the victims of confederated assassins. Whether such a line of conduct, proceeding from such motives, be viewed by your Lordships with that admiration of which I think it to be deserving—whether it is to be designated as weak and faulty, or as kind and forbearing, it is certain that the existing state of things has reduced many worthy families to actual want, and to all it has produced distress—the greater because it was unexpected, and, therefore, unprovided for. In several letters which I have in my possession from clergymen in the disturbed districts, they describe themselves as having had no controversy with their parishioners on the subject of tithes for twenty years, as not having had occasion during that time to levy a single distress. In other parishes the people acknowledged the moderation of the settlement under the Composition Act, begged the clergyman himself to become one of the commissioners for applotting the amount, and in some cases they have admitted that if they did not pay him what was due to him in the shape of tithes, to pay a larger sum in the shape of rent. Such was the state of things in many of the now disturbed parishes until the system of perpetual agitation commenced, until a frightful tyranny of fear and force was exercised by the lawless and desperate, over the peaceable and well-intentioned, above all, until tithes were denounced by spiritual authority and the people were exhorted in pastorals and from the altars to resist the payment of them by every means that wit and talent could devise with an artful reservation, indeed not likely to be much heeded by an irritable and thoughtless people, of not carrying their resistance to the open violation of the law. I need not tell your Lordships that the natural effects of such a mockery of moderation followed, and if it be a matter of satisfaction to such advisers to know it, they may learn that they have gained their ends in the utter destitution of the greater part of the Protestant clergy of Ireland. But I should hope that no good man will envy them their triumph. The only possible objection I think remains to be guarded against. It may be said, why is not the clergyman provided against the hour of need? My Lords, the beneficed clergyman, whatever has been industriously circulated to the contrary, is seldom rich. His income is always exaggerated, and he generally obtains it at an advanced time of life; his habits, his associations, and his pursuits impose upon him, without fault of his, the necessity of an expenditure that might be avoided in other stations. The demands upon him for public and private charities, and for contributions for various useful undertakings, are not inconsiderable: his children are to be educated, and placed in suitable ways of life. You require of him no common attainments as a qualification for his profession; and by so doing you have engendered in his bosom the honest pride of accustoming himself and his offspring to what is seemly and liberal. All this may be now thought wrong and uncalled for; but time was when it was not thought so. If he be accounted rich in comparison with many of those around him, by reason of the superior decency of his mode of living, in almost every instance except where he is possessed of private fortune he dies poor. This simple statement will sufficiently explain to your Lordships why clergymen in the enjoyment of what is called, and often falsely called, a good preferment, may without the imputation of improvident expenditure, be reduced to great necessity by the subtraction of a single year's income. In the present case the loss was frequently extended to that of two, three, and even four years. The noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government will do the clergy the justice to admit that they have not been importunate in their claims for relief, nor unreasonable in their expectations of its amount; and I am bound to do him the justice to say, that the proposal of relief originated with himself in the Committee, and I am confident that even an increased amount would have been cheerfully acceded to by him had it been asked for; my Lords I have nothing more to add except to express my thanks to his Majesty's Ministers, and especially to the right hon. the secretary for Ireland, for having proposed this measure, and for having urged its adoption so warmly; and I leave it with your Lordships to be dealt with now as the exigency or the justice of the case may require.

The Earl of *Wicklow* said, that it was not his intention, as the noble viscount proposed to defer the commitment of the Bill, to go fully into the subject at present; at the same time he could not avoid observing that the second reading had taken place without due notice, and before the printed Bill even was in the possession of their Lordships, so that up to the present time no opportunity of discussion had been afforded. He hoped, therefore, the noble Viscount would instead of Thursday, fix some more distant period for the Committee, when the subject could be fully discussed. On Thursday the House was to go into Committee on the Reform Bill, which would fully occupy their attention. He hoped, therefore, some other day would be fixed for the present measure, which he did not intend to oppose, although he thought it required numerous and considerable Amendments.

Viscount *Melbourne* did not intend to deprive the House of the opportunity of discussing the measure, and the second reading had been hastened only because they thought it expedient to proceed with as much despatch as possible to relieve the urgent distress of the excellent body of persons whose relief the Bill had in view. It was desirable that the redress should be speedy, and that redress depended entirely upon the speed with which the Bill passed that House. Any delay of the Bill would delay the relief of the meritorious class of persons to whom relief was to be extended. He had no objection to any day which might be convenient to the noble Lord, but for the reasons he had stated he hoped there would not be any unnecessary delay.

The Earl of *Wicklow* had no disposition to retard the progress of the measure. But perhaps a delay of two or three days might expedite the Bill by affording time for the necessary amendments to be proposed and introduced. On the Motion of Viscount Melbourne, the Bill was then ordered to be committed on Friday.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, May 8, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bill brought in.—By Mr. MACKINNON, to Repeal the Usury Laws.

Committee appointed.—On the Motion of Sir ROBERT INGLIS, to Inquire into the State of the Library of the House of Commons.

Petitions presented. By Mr. GOULBURN, from Colgrave, Hickling, and Overbroughton, Notts;—by Mr. J. E. GORDON, from Temple Michael, and six other Places in Ireland;—and by Mr. ANDREW JOHNSTON, from Stirling,—against the Ministerial Plan of Education in Ireland.—By Mr. O'CONNELL, from Balmahony, and Donamine,—for the Abolition of Tithes in Ireland; from the Political Union, Birmingham, to postpone the Consideration of the subject of Irish Tithes, and of all other Subjects, until the meeting of a new Parliament under the Reform Bill; from Einley, for an Investigation into the Conduct of Dr. Fitzgerald; and from the Royal College of Surgeons (Dublin), not to extend the Anatomy Bill to Ireland.—By Lord SANDON, from J. Todd Naylor, Deputy Chairman of the Mexican and South American Association at Liverpool, complaining of the recent Directions to demand the South-Sea Duty, and for Relief.—By Mr. PIGOTT, from Quainton, Dinton, and Marston, to enable a certain Majority of the Rate-payers of any Parish to adopt Plans for the Employment of the Able-bodied Poor.—By Sir JOHN NEWPORT, from Waterford, to Abolish the New Vestries Act; from Harbour Grace, Conception Bay, Newfoundland, for a Representative Local Legislature for that Island.—By Mr. CUTLAR FERGUSSON, from Port Glasgow, to be joined to Greenock in sending a Member to Parliament under the Reform of Parliament (Scotland) Bill;—and from Kirkudbright, against the Hypothec (Scotland) Bill.—By Mr. HUME, from the Parish of St. Pancras (Middlesex), to include the whole Parish in the proposed Borough of Marylebone; from Walsall, against any Grant to the Irish Clergy; from the Crape Manufacturers of Great Yarmouth, against the Factories Regulations Bill; from the Wick and Pulteney-town Subscription Library, against all Taxes on Knowledge; from the Protestant Dissenters of Beominster, against Tithes; from certain Booksellers, for the Repeal of the Duty on Newspapers, &c.; and from William Carpenter, against the Act of 60 George 3rd, cap. 9.—By Mr. FYSHE PALMER, from the Congregation of Castle Street Chapel, Reading, against the Punishment of Death for Crimes against Property.—By Lord NUGENT, from Horsham;—and by Mr. THICKNESSE, from Blackburn, and Ampthill,—for the same object.—By Mr. WARBURTON, from the National Political Union, in favour of the Anatomy Bill.—By Mr. JOHN WYNN, from Galway, for a Provision in the Reform Bill to secure the Peculiar Franchise of Galway.—By Mr. SPRING RICE, from the Parishes of St. Edmund and St. David, Exeter, against the Exeter and Crediton Railway Bill.

COURTS OF REQUEST.] Mr. *Hunt* moved for certain papers relating to the Courts of Request held in and for London, Westminster, and Southwark, and for Middlesex and Surrey. The papers he wished for, were Returns of the number of cases decided in these Courts within one month. He should have extended the period for the Returns still further, but that he understood there would be some difficulty in making the Returns, on account of the number of cases decided. His object in moving for them was, to show how the power of arrest for debt was abused in this country, and how much injustice was committed on the poor man by means of these Courts. The hon. Member concluded by moving for a "Return of all cases heard and determined in the several Courts of Request in the cities of London and Westminster, in the borough of Southwark and parts adjacent, in the counties of Middlesex and Surrey, including the Palace Court and that of the Tower Hamlets, for one month, ending the 31st of December, 1831, specifying all the judgments made in each Court, the amount of each claim, the sum awarded, and stating whether paid, whether the party was distrained upon, or sent to prison; stating the amount of fees paid in each case, and the length of imprisonment adjudged in each case; also stating what salaries are paid to each of the officers, and the amount in hand, if any."

Mr. *John Campbell* said, it was impossible for any one to object to the Motion of the hon. Member, except that it was confined to too short a space of time. There could be no doubt, that the greatest injustice was often practised through the means of the power of imprisoning for debt; and, for his part, he wished, that the hon. Member had extended his Motion to returns of this sort from all the Courts in the country.

Mr. *Lennard* perfectly agreed with the hon. and learned Member, that the Returns ought to be general, and that the House should determine what was the number of persons throughout the country liable to be imprisoned for small debts. He had, some years ago, brought this subject under their consideration; and, from Returns then made, it appeared, that, in one of the chief Courts of this kind, the number of cases decided in a single year amounted to above 18,000, although the Court only sat two days in a week; thus giving an average of between 170 and 180 for each day. It was quite impossible to believe, that these cases could be at all considered with care, and he had no doubt, that great injustice was often done to parties in these Courts. Indeed, he believed he might refer to the right hon. Baronet opposite for a confirmation of his opinion, since, if he recollected rightly, that right hon. Baronet had said, in a speech connected with this subject, that a prudent man would not go into these Courts as a suitor. He trusted, that the subject would be speedily investigated, and some remedy proposed for the abuses that were universally admitted to exist.

Sir *Robert Peel* was much inclined to believe, that great abuses did exist in these Courts; but the fact was, on the occasion alluded to by the hon. Member, as it was generally found with regard to questions relating to the reform of abuses, that the further he advanced, the more extended his horizon became, and the greater appeared the necessity for an extensive Reform. The subject of imprisonment for debt on mesne process was then before the House; but it was said, that it would be in vain to abolish that, while the power of imprisoning in execution for small debts continued to exist, since a litigious creditor could easily avail himself of the latter mode to punish and oppress his debtor. He thought, that the whole question of imprisonment for debt ought to be taken into consideration at the same time. That portion of it which related to imprisonment for debt on mesne process had been referred to the Law Commissioners, who, he believed, had but recently made their Report.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with the right hon. Baronet that the whole subject had better be discussed at one time, and, in his opinion, there ought to be, as early as convenient, some inquiry instituted into the matter, as the power of imprisonment for small debts was liable to many great objections.

Mr. *Hume* recommended, that the Returns, instead of being for one month, should be for one year.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he should gladly accede to this recommendation. He had already mentioned the reason of his having at first introduced his Motion in so limited a shape. As a proof of the sort of abuses to which the power of imprisonment gave rise, he mentioned that, a short time since, a man had been committed to prison for not paying a sum of 1*s.* for debt and 8*s.* costs, and that the man was so poor he must have starved, if his fellow-prisoners had not made a subscription for his relief.

Motion agreed to.

PLURALITIES—CHURCH REFORM.] Mr. *Hume* moved for a Return of the "name of every person holding more than one dignity, benefice, church, or chapel, of the Established Church in England and Wales; stating how many, and the name of each such dignity, benefice, church, and chapelry, and the gross and nett annual value of all such, upon the average of the last three years for which the account can be made out; stating also the number of years the incumbent has held each preferment or benefice, what duties are performed by him, what curates are employed under him, and the amount of stipends actually paid to each curate, in each of these three years."

Sir *Robert Inglis* thought the hon. Member was bound to show cause for his Motion before it was adopted, the rather, as it was one which could not be acted upon without an exercise of inquisitorial power hardly compatible with the liberty of the subject.

Mr. *Goulburn* felt himself inclined to oppose the Motion; but, certainly, he wished, that some grounds should be laid for granting it. He would take that opportunity of asking the right hon. Gentleman opposite a question concerning the deaneries of Downe and Raphoe. Had they been bestowed on the present incumbents, on any understanding similar to that entered into with the present Bishop of Derry?

Mr. *Stanley* said, that, with respect to the deanery of Downe, he had no information at present what were its revenues. With regard to the deanery of Raphoe, he believed them to have been about 2,500*l.* a-year. The present incumbent had accepted it on condition that he should receive the tithes of the parish of Raphoe alone, and the four parishes that had before been united with it, were, in future, to go to four different incumbents.

Mr. *Hume* said, his object was, to direct the attention of the House to the monstrous abuses of the present Church Establishment, ere it sanctioned the Archbishop of

Canterbury's pseudo pluralities' abuse reform bill. Having been, from early youth, an eye-witness of the admirable results of the system of the Church of Scotland, and knowing, that non-residence was not possible under that system, and knowing, that the reward of the pastor was made to depend on his efficiency, it might be, that the plurality non-resident system of the Church of England, which made the emolument, in most instances, be in the inverse ratio of the service rendered—assumed an exaggerated form in his eyes; and, accordingly, he was anxious that his views should rest upon incontrovertible facts, and was also anxious, that the House should be in possession of those facts previous to the discussion of the merits of the Archbishop of Canterbury's mock reform bill. Hence his present Motion, the necessity of which perhaps, would be more apparent from a simple statement of the number of non-resident incumbents in England, in one year, 1831. It appeared, from papers on the Table of the House, that, in that year, the number of benefices, held under the Church of England was 10,532. He had the authority, indeed, of an intelligent clergyman to fix the number at 12,600 but would take the lower number. Of that number, there were 2,619 incumbents exempt from residence, from various causes, 2,147 exempt with licence, and 1,354 non-resident, without any exemption licence; making, altogether, 6,120 non-resident, out of a total of 10,532. Of these 6,120 non-resident, 1,590 were reported as doing duty elsewhere; but, deducting them, there remained but 4,413 clergymen resident in the parishes whence they derived large emoluments. Was not this monstrous? He would take it upon himself to assert, that such abuses were unknown in any other church in Europe. Then let them consider the disgraceful manner in which so many of the *bonâ fide* working clergy were paid, while the bloated non-resident pluralists were lording it in stately chariots and fine linen. He knew of at least 100 such clergymen, who did not receive as much in the year for their exertions as journeymen carpenters; but even the evils of non-residence were not confined to sleek vicars and well-fed rectors, who did nothing but spend large revenues in the most approved manner of fashion. The total number of curates of the Church of England, in 1831, was 4,254; of these, 1,393 resided in glebe houses, and 805 in private residences in their respective parishes; that is, there were only 2,198 actual residents; in other words, there were at least 2,000 parishes in England without a resident curate or rector of its established and enormously overpaid Church. And how did the most reverend head of that Church propose to remedy the evils of non-residence and pluralities? Why, by preventing pluralities, with endless exceptions, from being held, if distant more than thirty miles from the resident living. He might as well, so far as any practical benefit was concerned, have fixed the limit at 300 miles. He had found, that, of individuals holding Church preferment in this country, 162 were in receipt of less than 160*l.* per annum, and that, in the whole Church of England, there were only 84 curates who received that sum. In the diocese of Lincoln, there were 440 persons holding one benefice each, 256 persons who held each two benefices, while, in the same diocese, there were 76 individuals who were in the enjoyment of 304 benefices. From the result of the inquiries he had made, he was led to believe, that much of the fearful increase of crime of late in the remote districts, was to be attributed to the non-residence of the clergy. Under all these circumstances, he hoped he had laid sufficient grounds before the House to induce it to grant the Motion. He had carefully avoided the mention of names; but when the proper time arrived, he was fully prepared to go at length into the subject.

Mr. *Trevor* agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex in thinking that the curates of the Church of England were inadequately paid. He also concurred in the most part of the hon. Member's Motion, but he would suggest the propriety of withdrawing that part which required returns of the amount of the income of the Church.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* thought the Returns went too far, inasmuch as they meddled with the incomes of individuals. The hon. Member might as well move for a return of the income of the country gentlemen as of the clergy.

Mr. *Warburton* said, he could see no reason why returns of the Church revenues should not be made. He felt, that every man who received an income for the discharge of particular duties should not only fulfil those duties, but also should not hesitate to afford every information as to the amount of income he received.

Mr. *Weyland* was ready to agree in the Motion for returns of the gross amount of the value of all livings where the incumbent was non-resident, and in which the duties were performed by curates, and also of the amount of the stipends paid such curates. But he did not think the House ought to extend such inquiry to livings where the incumbents were resident.

Mr. *John Campbell* said, that the object of the hon. member for Middlesex was, to obtain returns of all pluralists—a piece of information which he (Mr. Campbell) conceived to be indispensable when the House came to take into consideration and to deal with a bill which had been sent down from the other House of Parliament, and which had been introduced by the head of the Church, relative to pluralities. This information could only be learnt from the Returns now sought for by the hon. member for Middlesex.

Mr. *Sheil* saw nothing objectionable in the Motion. The Returns were analogous to the returns made by the Irish clergy of the amount of their incomes, and he thought them necessary to the due consideration of the Pluralities Bill.

Dr. *Lushington* did not see any great objection to the Motion, and, in some respects, he thought it desirable, as it would tend to elucidate the value of Church livings, which he knew was greatly exaggerated. He, for one, would never bring himself to think, that Church property was, in any respect, less sacred than private property, though, perhaps, the former, under peculiar circumstances, might be a fairer subject of investigation. He believed the Church of England would benefit by this inquiry; for he knew, that circumstances favourable to that establishment, and which were not known to the House, would be elicited in the inquiry.

Mr. *Trevor* wished to know whether the hon. member for Middlesex would consent to the proposed verbal amendment in his Motion?

Mr. *Hume* declined making any change.

Sir *Thomas Baring* had not intended to make a single observation, and should have remained silent, if it had not been for a remark which had fallen from the hon. member for Middlesex, who appeared to attribute the increase of crime in England to the state of the Church. Now, he (Sir Thomas Baring) should rather attribute the increase of crime to Parliament, and some of their pernicious enactments. Such, for instance, as the Beer Bill, and many others of equally mischievous tendency. He must say, that the grossest exaggerations were circulated respecting the value of Church livings.

Mr. *Ruthven* suggested the propriety of extending the Returns sought for to Ireland.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that, if the hon. Member who had just sat down would take the trouble to look back to the minutes of the day before the recess, he would find, that the hon. member for Middlesex had moved for and obtained returns from Ireland, far more extensive than those which were the object of the hon. Member's present Motion; indeed, so extensive were they, that he (Mr. Stanley), had he been in the House at the time they were moved for, should have felt it his duty to oppose the Motion. He, however, saw no objection to the present Motion, and he thought it was one of the greatest mistakes of the friends of the Established Church to oppose making returns of its revenues, under the supposition that they were sought with a view to reduction.

Sir *Matthew White Ridley* conceived the Returns were necessary, to enable the House to form a correct judgment on the very important Bill which had been alluded to by the hon. and learned member for Stafford, and which would require the greatest attention from every true friend of the Church.

Returns ordered.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Wednesday, May 9, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bills read a third time.—Friendly Societies, and Barbadoes Provisions.

Petitions presented. By Lord DURHAM, from Durham, for the Abolition of Slavery; and from Yeovil and Perth, in favour of Reform.—By Earl Grey, from Donamaine, for the Abolition of Tithes Ireland.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.] Earl *Grey* presented Petitions against the existing system of Tithes in Ireland, from Doncaster, Calne, Dumfries, Wigton. He then proceeded, to the following effect:—And now, my Lords, after the proceedings of Monday last, and after the result of that night's debate and decision, your Lordships are probably prepared for the information which I feel it to be my duty to communicate to you. The result of that debate and decision certainly reduced me, in conjunction with my colleagues, to the alternative of either immediately withdrawing ourselves from the service of his Majesty, or of tendering to his Majesty our advice to take such means as appeared to us to be justified by the necessity of the case to ensure the success of the Reform Bill; and, in the event of that advice not being received, humbly and respectfully to tender our resignation to his Majesty. The last alternative was that which, after much consideration, we were induced to adopt. We offered to his Majesty the advice which we thought it our duty, under the circumstances of the times, to offer: the alternative was accepted by his Majesty, and he was graciously pleased to accept our resignation; at the same time honouring us with the fullest approbation of our services during the period that we have been in his Majesty's Councils, during which period we have uniformly experienced from his Majesty a support and confidence for which I shall always feel most deeply grateful. My Lords, these are the circumstances under which we now stand. Having tendered to his Majesty our resignations, and those resignations having been accepted, and holding office, therefore, only until our successors are appointed, your Lordships will, I am sure, see the propriety of our not entering into the consideration of any public business on which it is probable a difference of opinion may prevail. Such being the case, it is not my intention to propose to-morrow that we go on with the consideration of the Reform Bill. But there is a measure of great importance, the second reading of which stands for to-night, I mean the Bill for the regulation of the Admiralty and Navy Offices. It is of great moment that this Bill should pass with as little delay as possible, as it has received the sanction of the other House of Parliament, and as the time fixed for its coming into operation is the 14th of May. If, therefore, no material objection exists to that measure, I hope my noble friend behind me will be allowed to proceed with it. If, however, there is any objection to it, or any probability of a difference of opinion respecting it, I propose that the proceeding upon it be deferred to a more convenient opportunity, for, as I have already observed, under the circumstances in which we are placed, I trust your Lordships will concur with me in the propriety of adjourning the consideration of all questions that are likely to produce anything like contest.

Lord *Ellenborough* intimated the probability that some debate would arise on the Bill mentioned by the noble Earl, so that it might be expedient to defer the Motion for the second reading.

Earl *Grey* assented to the postponement.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of the Admiralty and Navy Offices Bill was accordingly discharged.

REFORM—BIRMINGHAM PETITION.] The *Lord Chancellor:* My Lords, I hold in my hand a Petition from Dewsbury, signed by above 3,000 persons, who, I am informed, are of the most respectable description, in favour of Parliamentary Reform. I also hold in my hand a petition from the town of Birmingham in favour of Parliamentary Reform. This petition was agreed to at a meeting which was held on the 7th of the present month. A petition proceeding from so large a body of persons appeared to me to be worthy of your Lordships' deepest consideration. I have read the petition attentively, and although it contains opinions in which some of your Lordships may not concur, it is couched in respectful language, and I cannot find in it any statement upon which its reception can be objected to. This petition is the result of a meeting, in numbers unexampled. I have been informed by an individual, on whom I can rely, that in the course of the day above 200,000 persons attended that meeting. For the accuracy of that estimate, of course I cannot myself vouch; but I had it from an individual of great respectability, of great powers of calculation, and who, I am quite confident, is incapable of wilful misrepresentation. I will not trouble your Lordships with entering more fully into this subject; but I beg leave to state that I stand in the same situation as my noble friend, having felt it my duty most respectfully to tender my resignation to his Majesty, in consequence of his Majesty's having declined the advice which we thought it our duty to offer him. In stating this, however, I must add, that to the latest hour of my existence, I shall never cease to entertain the deepest and most heartfelt gratitude for the repeated proofs of confidence which I have received from his Majesty, and for the gracious kindness with which his Majesty has always condescended to treat me. As the petition is signed only by the Chairman of the meeting, it can, in point of form, be received only as the petition of an individual.

At the suggestion of the Earl of Suffolk, the petition was read at length by the Clerk.

The Earl of *Suffolk:* My Lords, I think that petition does great credit to the people of Birmingham. I congratulate myself on changing my place in this House. I congratulate the country on the change; for I am persuaded that in opposition my noble friends near me may be infinitely serviceable. In opposition they were the instruments of giving freedom to the Catholics of Ireland, and to the Dissenters of England. But, above all, I congratulate the people on the firm, but peaceable manner, in which they have shown their determination to obtain Parliamentary Reform. By their temperate and conciliatory conduct, they have won it from their friends; let them proceed in the same course, and they will extort it from their enemies.

The Earl of *Plymouth* observed, that at meetings such as that from which the Birmingham petition proceeded, many persons attended, not for the purpose of petitioning, but influenced solely by curiosity. He denied that there was the intense anxiety among the people, on the subject of Reform, which was pretended. He denied the general respectability of the Political Unions; at least of those of which he had any knowledge. With respect to the particular meeting in question, it would not appear surprising that it was so numerous, when it was known that a district of from fourteen to eighteen miles in circumference had been ransacked to collect an assembly for the occasion; and that in some of the Unions it was a rule that any person above twelve years of age was eligible as a member.

The *Lord Chancellor* did not wish to prolong the conversation on this subject. He would merely observe, that there could be no doubt that there might be some men, women, and children, who were induced to attend the meeting from motives of curiosity; but from the information which he had received, there could also be no doubt that the great body and bulk of the persons who assembled on that occasion were most anxious for the furtherance of the objects for which the meeting was convened. When they were talking of hundreds of thousands, it was a matter of little importance if a few hundreds were liable to the remark of the noble Earl. He was happy, however, that the noble Earl had afforded him an opportunity of stating the loyal and peaceable demeanour of the great meeting in question. There had not been the slightest disturbance.

Petition laid on the Table.

REFORM—COMMITTEE.] Lord *Ellenborough* observed, that if the Order for proceeding with the Reform Bill in Committee to-morrow were discharged, another day should be fixed for that proceeding.

Earl *Grey* said, that he meant only to move to discharge the Order for to-morrow; but he saw no necessity for naming any other day.

The Earl of *Carnarvon:* The noble Earl has moved that the Order of the Day for proceeding to-morrow with the consideration of the Reform Bill in Committee be discharged. My Lords, I do not think that we shall do our duty to our Sovereign, left by the extraordinary conduct of the noble Earl and his colleagues in a most difficult, if not a most perilous situation, if we permit this order to be so contemptuously discharged, and abandon the measure now, because we expressed our wish—a wish which we share with the great majority of intelligent persons of the country—to proceed with it on the most liberal and conciliatory principles. Because the mode of proceeding which your Lordships have thought proper to adopt with respect to the Bill, is not exactly that of which the noble Lords opposite approve —because the alphabetical arrangement which the noble Lords opposite recommend, your Lordships have not thought it proper to follow—because your Lordships decline to consider schedules A and B until you have considered schedules C and D—such are the only grounds on which the noble Lords opposite have proceeded. My Lords, the noble Lords opposite may act as they think fit: we know the grounds, the slight grounds, which their defeat on Monday evening afforded them for one of the most atrocious propositions with which a subject ever dared to insult the ears of the Sovereign. We have heard, and it was what I naturally expected to hear, that his Majesty, who was among the first to recommend Reform upon broad and constitutional principles, finding himself reduced to the alternative to which his Ministers ventured to reduce him, has acted as became a Sovereign of the House of Brunswick; and by so doing he has established an additional title to the respect and affection of his subjects. But, my Lords, it shall not go forth to the public, because the noble Lords opposite, whatever may be the motives which have influenced them, have determined to abandon the measure, it shall not go forth to the public that this House is unwilling to enter into the discussion of its merits. This Bill must be discussed, unless the majorty of your Lordships, which I do not believe, are opposed to that discussion. If, therefore, the Order of the Day for proceeding to-morrow with the consideration of the measure be discharged, I will move, instanter, that it stand for Monday next. Should it be impracticable to bring the subject forward on so early a day, it may easily be postponed; whereas, if it be fixed for too late a day, we cannot advance the period of the discussion. I, therefore, move, that your Lordships proceed with the consideration of the Reform Bill in Committee on Monday next.

Earl *Grey:* My Lords, I have been too much accustomed to the ill-timed, violent, personal, and I must add, unparliamentary language of the noble Earl who has just sat down, as well as to his personal attacks on myself and my colleagues, to be much affected or even surprised by the very disorderly attack which the noble Earl has considered it necessary to make on this occasion. Nor is it for the defence of myself personally against the imputations which the noble Earl has thought proper to cast upon me, that I again rise to address your Lordships. I trust, my Lords, that it is not necessary for me to do so; that in the estimation of your Lordships and of the public, my character is such, that I may without presumption consider myself as sufficiently shielded against the danger of suffering from such imputations. The noble Earl has been pleased to qualify the advice which I thought it my duty respectfully to tender to my Sovereign, as atrocious and insulting; and there are other noble Lords on that side of the House I perceive, who appear to agree with the noble Earl in that opinion. All I can say is, that I deferred giving that advice until the very last moment: that I did not give it until the necessity of the case, and my sense of public duty, imposed upon me an obligation which appeared to me to be imperative. Whether I was right or wrong, is a question which, whenever the noble Lord opposite may think proper to bring it under discussion before your Lordships, I am prepared to argue and satisfactorily, I trust, to vindicate my conduct to your Lordships and my country. But I appeal confidently to your Lordships and to the country, whether, until that period shall arrive, I may not rely upon my character to save me from the imputation of sinister motives with which the noble Earl was pleased most unjustly to charge me. [The Earl of *Carnarvon* said across the Table that he did not impute sinister motives to the noble Earl]. The feeling which prompts the noble Earl to make his violent addresses to your Lordships, is such as sometimes to render him unconscious of the language he uses. If, however, the noble Earl disclaims the expression which I quoted, of course I cannot wish to tie down the noble Earl to words which he already regrets to have used. I repeat, that the advice which I offered to my Sovereign, when the proper time comes I am prepared to defend; and in the meanwhile I throw myself upon the candour of your Lordships and of the country, and ask if it be possible that I could have been actuated by any other motive than a strict sense of duty? Having as a Minister of the Crown given the advice which I thought it my duty to give, and that advice not having been accepted, I had no alternative but most humbly and respectfully to tender my resignation to his Majesty; which his Majesty with that unwearied goodness he has ever shown me, was graciously pleased to accept. The noble Earl says, that there was no adequate cause for our resignation, that the grounds on which we proceeded were only trifling; that they were only mere matters of form; that the proceeding proposed by the other side was conciliatory; that, in point of fact, it was only if the discussion of the schedules C and D should or should not precede the discussion of the schedules A and B. If that was really the case, if the question was as unimportant as the noble Earl represents it, then the noble Earl is right, and he is justified in censuring the Ministers; but that was not the case, and in the debate on Monday evening, I distinctly stated to your Lordships the reasons which rendered it evident to me that the question which we were then discussing was of the utmost importance, and that to postpone the consideration of the schedules, taking them out of the order assigned to them, materially affected the principle of the Bill. The main principle of the Bill, that on which my colleagues and I place the greatest stress, is, to relieve the Constitution from the numerous evils which result from the existence of the nomination boroughs. The proposition made to your Lordships on Monday was, to postpone the consideration of that subject, and make the extent of the disfranchisement depend on the number of towns to be enfranchised, thus making the disfranchisement which we regard as the essential part of the Bill, contingent upon another circumstance. That was a very material change in the character of the measure, and such a change, that it was quite impossible for us, without allowing the nomination boroughs to be part of the Constitution, to accede to it. But, my Lords, that is not all. In what situation was the author of the Bill placed after the question of Monday evening was carried? A noble Lord (Wharncliffe) declared that he was ready to go the whole length of schedule A, and the noble Earl (Harrowby) said in that discussion, that he was disposed to grant a considerable Reform; but I did not hear any other noble Lord on that side of the House, express his willingness to go along with those noble Lords, to agree to the whole of the disfranchisement comprehended in schedule A. But by whom was the proposition of Monday evening made? By a noble and learned Lord, who, in the course of his speech, stated, that he still considered the Bill to be inconsistent with the safety of the Government and subversive of the Constitution. What right had we to suppose that the noble and learned Lord would support the disfranchising portions of the Bill when they came to be considered, if we gave our consent to the postponement? And by whom was the noble and learned Lord's proposition supported? In the first place, by a noble Duke, who has declared that the present state of the Representation is incapable of being amended by human ingenuity or wisdom. By whom else was that proposition supported? By another noble Duke (Newcastle) who has declared himself hostile to any disfranchisement -by a noble Baron (Bexley) who expressed his hope that, by adopting the proposition of the noble and learned Lord, their Lordships might entirely avoid the necessity of any disfranchisement. My Lords, under these circumstances, is it not childish to say that the question decided by your Lordships on Monday was merely one of form or precedence? It involves the principle of the Bill, and it was quite impossible that we could, with any consistency, accept that as a boon which would have been at once destructive of our measure and our character. In the circumstances in which that decision placed me, I had first to see whether I could obtain the means of insuring the success of the measure; and having failed in that attempt, I had to consider whether it would be consistent with my duty to my Sovereign and to the public, and with the maintenance of my own character and honour, to continue the mere shadow of a Minister, and to have the Reform Bill taken out of my hands, for the purpose of being cut, carved, mutilated, and destroyed, just as its opponents might think proper. My Lords, I am convinced, that in the opinion of all your Lordships, even of those noble Lords who do not approve of the Reform Bill, the course which I have taken will be attributed only to a sense of the duty which I owe to my Sovereign and my country, and a sense of what was due to that personal honour which, I trust, I have never yet forfeited. I stand before the public responsible for my actions. I am ready to meet any charge which may be brought against me, and to vindicate my conduct and my motives whenever the proper occasion may arrive. One word, my Lords, as to what the noble Earl has chosen to call the contemptuous manner in which I have moved to discharge the Order for to-morrow. It is the usual motion on such occasions. It is not for me to appoint any other day. Even the noble Earl finds a difficulty in doing so. For myself, I certainly cannot proceed with the Bill under the circumstances which have occurred. I trust that out of all these unhappy differences, a measure of Reform may eventually arise, extensive, efficient, and beneficial (if not extensive and efficient, it will not be beneficial)—a measure which may be satisfactory to the country, and which may restore the attachment of the people to the institutions of the State. But it is impossible for me to proceed with the measure, subject to the daily alterations which might be forced upon me by a majority, four-fifths of which consist of persons who object to all Reform whatever. To the unjust, the ill-timed, and I will add, the unprovoked attack of the noble Earl, I should, perhaps, not have considered it necessary to make any answer, had I not been desirous to set myself right with your Lordships and with the public, with reference to the motives which have influenced me, and the sense of duty under which I have acted.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, that he

had made no attack upon the noble Earl, but as the noble Earl had made an attack upon him, he was sure that their Lordships would allow him to say a few words in explanation. It still appeared to him, that the other House of Parliament having sent the measure up to them, and their Lordships having determined to take it into consideration, if their Lordships should now determine not to go further, they would appear to dismiss it with contempt. Now he was sure that every Member of that House desired to afford to that measure the most earnest and the most complete attention. With regard to the complaint of the noble Earl, that he (the Earl of Carnarvon) had imputed motives to him, and sinister motives too, he would appeal to their Lordships, whether a single word that had fallen from him could be construed into the meaning of imputing any such motives to the noble Earl. Indeed, after what he had heard to-night, and a few nights ago, he, for one, could not form a conclusion as to what the motives were which had guided the noble Earl in the course which he had pursued. He thought that the noble Earl, when he spoke of the advice which he had tendered to the Sovereign, alluded to that which had been formerly alluded to in that House and elsewhere, namely, the making of such a number of Peers as would destroy the deliberative character and independence of the House of Lords. But though he condemned the giving of such advice, he had never imputed to the noble Earl that in giving it he was actuated by the personal motive of preserving himself and his colleagues in office; and he had never meant to insinuate that in tendering such a tremendous counsel to their Sovereign, they had done so for the purpose of making their way in a House in which they had been already outvoted. If the noble Earl supposed that he imputed any such motive to him in giving that counsel, he had quite misunderstood what had fallen from him, and if any person had imputed such a motive to the noble Earl, the imputation had not come from that side of the House. When he said that it was the most atrocious advice that any Minister had ever given to his Sovereign, the words were spoken in perfect good temper, though, undoubtedly, they were characterised by a warmth which became a friend of the Constitution, and a Member of that House—they emanated from a feeling which he should deeply and warmly entertain till the last moment of his existence. If, however, such an atrocious counsel had not been given to the Sovereign, and if it were other considerations that had induced the noble Earl to take the step which he had taken, he humbly begged the noble Earl's pardon for attributing to him such an unconstitutional line of conduct. Perhaps he had already exceeded the limits of an explanation, but he supposed, after the attack which had been made upon him, that he should be allowed to offer a few more observations to their Lordships in his vindication.

Lord *Dover* rose to order. The noble Earl should confine his observations to that which was immediately before the House, and he had no right to diverge from the strict line of explanation into other and irrelevant topics.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* was satisfied that he was perfectly in order, for he meant strictly to confine himself to the subject before the House. He had a Motion before the House, and to that Motion he attached no trivial importance. When he said he had been attacked by the noble Earl, he did conceive that the statement of the noble Earl as to the temper which he (the Earl of Carnarvon) manifested in making that Motion, and the warmth of feeling which he then displayed—a warmth of feeling which, when the Constitution was assailed, any man who loved that Constitution would not fail to evince—constituted an attack upon him. The statement of the noble Earl was, that he (the Earl of Carnarvon) was possibly in such a state of irritation as precluded him from knowing the import of his words. He had spoken not in anger, but in dismay, when he heard such a declaration as that made under such circumstances by the noble Earl to that assembly. If he was not wrong in supposing that such an advice as that he had already alluded to, had been given to the Sovereign, he would ask their Lordships whether the history of this country supplied an instance in which on such slight and trivial grounds a proceeding so involving the political independence and constitution of that House had been resorted to by any Administration? If such an advice had been given to the Sovereign, it was given in a spirit consistent with the mode of dealing which had been hitherto adopted by his Majesty's Ministers towards their Lordships,—it was given by Ministers who meant to deal with their Lordships as abject tools and instruments, precisely as they themselves were dealt with by those whom they could not deny to be their lords and masters. The Motion which he (the Earl of Carnarvon) had made, was made in order to enable every noble Peer in that House to make up his mind as to the course which he should pursue; and though amongst them there might be shades and differences of opinion as to the extent to which Reform was required, there was no difference of opinion on this point,—that, owing to circumstances to which he should not more particularly allude, but which he, for one, must ever deplore, a necessity existed for their conceding some considerable but the safest possible measure of Reform. It was for the purpose of affording to their Lordships an opportunity of proceeding with the consideration of this measure in Committee, and of introducing into it such amendments as they should think fit,—an opportunity that he regretted to find his Majesty's Government refused to give them,—that he had brought forward the Motion now before the House. Under such circumstances, he conceived it his duty to call on their Lordships not to adjourn the consideration of this measure for a long period, but for the shortest possible time. He proposed no unnecessary delay, when he proposed to fix the Committee for Monday next, and there would be no difficulty, should the House not then be in a situation to resume the subject (and there was no reason to think that it would not be so), to postpone the question until the House should be in a situation to resume the consideration of it. His Lordship concluded by moving, that the House do resolve into Committee on Monday—carried.

Their Lordships on the Motion of Earl Grey, adjourned till the 11th.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, May 9, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in, and read first and second time.—Regent's Park Acts Amendment; Labourers Employment.

Petitions presented. By Sir HUGH STEWART, from the County of Tyrone, for Re-enacting the Laws Regulating the Importation of Flax Seed into Ireland.—By the Marquis of CHANDOS, from the Association for Promoting Rational Humanity towards the Animal Creation, to prevent Cruelty to Animals; from Edinburgh and Leith, against the Adulteration of Coffee with Chicoree; from Olney, for a Speedy Consideration of the Poor Laws; from Port Glasgow, for Relief in the Shipping Interests; and from Galway, for Preserving the Peculiar Franchise of that Town; also, for the Repeal of the Stamp-duties on the Admission of Freemen to Corporations.—By Sir GEORGE WARRENDER, from H. Stewart, Chairman of a Meeting of the Commissioners of Supply for the County of Lanark, against the Hypothec (Scotland) Bill.—By Mr. WILKS, from the Members of a Friendly Society, in favour of the Friendly Societies Act Amendment Bill.—By Sir EDWARD SUGDEN, from the Attornies of Wilts, against the General Register Bill.—By Mr ROBERT VERNON SMITH, from Northampton, in favour of the Registration of Births Bill.—By Sir HUGH STEWART, from Camus-juxta, Mourne, and other Places;—by Earl JERMYN, from Ashley, and eleven other Places—against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland).—By the Earl of BELFAST, from the Grand Jury at Carrickfergus, to enable Grand Juries to put up Gates and levy Tolls on such Roads as they may think proper.—By Mr. BRISCOE, from Chowbeat, Tyldesley, and Burnley,—in favour of the Factories Regulation Bill; from Kingston-upon-Thames and Hereford,—for the Abolition of the Punishment of Death for Crimes against Property;—and by Mr. SPRING RICE, from Tullamore,—for the same.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.] Lord *Althorp* said: I feel it to be my duty to state to the House that, in consequence of what occurred in another place on Monday last, it appeared to his Majesty's Government that it would be quite impossible to carry the Reform Bill in such a manner as they deemed it their duty to carry it in, or without such alterations as would render it inefficient, and inconsistent with the pledges they had given for carrying it forward. Under these circumstances, there remained for them only this alternative—to tender their resignation to his Majesty, or to advise his Majesty to take such measures as would enable them to carry the Reform Bill efficiently, and, in case that advice should not be taken, then to tender their resignations. The latter course we adopted, and I have now to state to the House that we did tender advice such as I have mentioned, which, not being received, we then tendered our resignations, and that his Majesty was graciously pleased to receive them. At present, therefore, we only hold office until our successors are appointed. It is impossible for me, in making this statement, not to express for myself, and I may confidently speak, also, for my colleagues, our sense of the flattering kindness and condescension with which we have been treated by his Majesty ever since we came into office. For myself, I can only say, that the manner in which I have ever been treated by his Majesty has been such as to ensure my warm gratitude to him so long as I shall live. This is all I feel it necessary to state at present, and, I believe, the best mode in which I can now proceed is, to move that the Order of the Day for the second reading of the Scotch Reform Bill be read, for the purpose of postponing it. The noble Lord sat down amidst long-continued cheering.

Lord *Ebrington* then rose and said, that he could not refrain, after the confidence which had been reposed by the House in the noble Lord and his colleagues, from expressing the deep regret he felt at the announcement which had then been made, as well as at the failure of the measure which had been carried through that House by so great a majority. Under the circumstances, he should feel it his duty, though he wished the task had fallen upon one better qualified than himself—to give notice that, to-morrow, he would move an Address to his Majesty on the present state of public affairs. Whatever might be the opinions entertained by hon. Members, he was sure that every one who had a seat in that House would feel it his duty to attend; and, in order to that end, he would follow up his first notice with another, viz. that he would move that, the House be called over.

Mr. *Gore Langton* said, that he must express his deep regret at the defeat of the measure of Reform in the manner in which it had been accomplished, for he was sure that nothing short of the measure which had passed that House would satisfy the country. He trusted that the House would stand by the Bill and not support any Government which was not prepared to carry that Measure, or one equally efficient, into full effect.

Mr. *Hume* said, that it was impossible he could abstain from expressing his opinion on the event that had occurred, and on the course which had been pursued by his Majesty's Ministers. He felt bound, in justice, to say, that the noble Lord and his colleagues, placed in the position they had been by the other House, had, as men of honour, no other course left to them to pursue, except the one which they had taken; and, he would further say, that they had acted with honour to themselves, not only in the opinion of that House, but he was also sure in that of the nation; and he must also emphatically state, that, to have the expectations of an united people, in which they were led on from day to day, put an end to, and frustrated in the manner they had been by the other House, was a subject of the deepest regret. He, as a sincere Reformer, could not but deeply deplore that the course of a measure by which the popular expectations seemed likely, after long delay and disappointment, to be realized, should have been interrupted and perverted. He did anticipate that the noble Earl who had introduced a measure so consonant to the general wishes and general interest, would have been able, with the support and countenance under which he introduced it, to carry it to a happy and prosperous conclusion. He should await, with anxiety, the result of the Motion of the noble Lord to-morrow. He would again express his approbation of the conduct of Ministers, and his regret at what had occurred; and he hoped and trusted that, every man who had a seat in that House would attend, and be ready to give that opinion firmly and manfully, which the dignity of the House and the peace of the country required.

Lord *Althorp* said, that his noble friend (the member for Devon) had given a notice which he would wish a few moments' time to consider. He would submit, that, in the present state of affairs, and in the present crisis, any course which might throw embarrassment in the way of the formation of a new Administration, ought not to be taken; and he would, therefore, wish that his noble friend would for a short time postpone his notice.

Sir *John Newport* differed from the noble Lord who had just sat down, and earnestly entreated his noble friend, the member for Devonshire, not to withdraw his notice. In times like these it was proper it should be known that what that House had once sanctioned by a majority of votes—what the people believed to be necessary to the well-being of the country—that House was determined to obtain. To the propriety, then, of that part of the noble Lord's notice which related to a motion for an Address to his Majesty, he most heartily assented, but the other part of the noble Lord's notice he thought impracticable; it was impossible that a call of the House could take place at so early a period as to-morrow. Many Members were not within reach of a summons to attend, and, therefore, it would be hard to inflict upon them the penalties which absence would subject them to. He thought, therefore, that the noble Lord should withdraw that part of his notice; but, in the Motion for the Address, he trusted he would persevere. He was sure that every hon. Member within reach would attend freely and honestly to express his opinions upon such an occasion. He knew of no circumstances under which such a step was rendered so imperatively necessary. He thought it was proper that the sense of the House should be known before a new Administration was formed.

Mr. *Labouchere* said, that, he felt it his duty to express his ardent desire that the noble member for Devon would persist in his intention. He felt that, if in the present crisis they were not firm—if they were false to their constituents and their own recorded votes—if they did not convey to the Throne the knowledge that they felt the greatest alarm at the formation of any administration which was not based upon the principle of carrying Reform in Parliament, they would expose the country to the risk of the heaviest calamities. He was sure, however, that the House would do its duty, and then he was also sure that the country, though they heard with regret the misfortune that had befallen, would also hear it with calmness. But if the House stood not where it ought to stand—in the front of the battle—then scenes would occur which he shuddered to contemplate. It was idle to suppose that, if the House of Commons did not do their duty—if its Members were such cravens as to allow a Government friendly to the people, and honest in their friendship, to be scattered and put out, in consequence of the proceedings of a majority of the other House of Parliament, they would not be considered, and justly considered, by the nation, as base deserters of their duty. Reform was safe if they did their duty; but if they did not they would be responsible for the scenes which might occur, and which, he was afraid, would be of a nature to appal the stoutest heart.

Mr. *O'Connell* would trespass upon the attention of the House but for one moment. Humble individual as he was, he could not abstain from expressing his admiration of the course which Government had pursued. They had acted wisely and well. His hon. friend the member for Middlesex had talked of the expectations of the people of England being frustrated—that he took to be impossible. The people of England had spoken emphatically from one end of the country to the other, and, wherever an opportunity of returning a Reformer occurred, the result proved what were their sentiments on the question of Reform. The only question now was, whether the people would be true to themselves, or whether they would suffer an intriguing faction to usurp their rights—the nominees of Peers to fill the places of their real Representatives—the combination of a party to prevent the restoration of their constitutional rights and privileges? The people of England, if true to themselves, would insist upon Reform—the people of Scotland would manfully insist upon it—and they never yet insisted upon having any thing which they did not obtain. With their good broad swords they asserted, maintained, and made national, the creed and the religious form of worship which they loved; with like success, but without the broad sword, he hoped the people of Scotland would now insist upon this Reform of their Representation. He could safely answer for it that the people of Ireland—the universal people of Ireland—would not shrink from the part which belonged to them in demanding, and persisting in the demand for Reform. He hoped the noble Lord would persevere in the motion of which he had given notice. He hoped, too, that this circumstance would mark the debate of the House upon that Motion to-morrow—that no man who voted for Reform would, now that a new Ministry was to be formed, shrink from expressing his honest and unbiassed opinion of the upright and independent conduct of the present Government. He had too high an opinion of the hon. Gentlemen who had voted for that measure to suppose that a skulker or a recreant would be found among them. Let their opinion, then, firmly, but respectfully, reach the Throne; and, in any Address which they might vote, let them inform his Majesty that his truly loyal subjects—those who placed his illustrious family on the Throne of these islands—were the most determined to see the rights of his people restored.

Mr. *James* wished to know from the noble Lord, whether he was then prepared or would be prepared to-morrow to explain the specific grounds, or immediate causes, which led to the resignation of himself and his colleagues?

Lord *Althorp* did not feel himself at liberty to state more than he had stated—namely, that Ministers, having proffered their Sovereign an advice which was not adopted, they tendered a resignation of their offices, which was accepted.

Mr. *Baring* had intended not to express his sentiments on the present occasion, reserving himself till the noble Lord's

Motion of to-morrow, but he felt himself compelled to say a few words in consequence of what had fallen from the hon. Members who had just addressed the House. Those hon. Members told them to beware of the perils and agitation which were likely to arise throughout the country from the announcement of the noble Lord opposite; but he would take leave to suggest the propriety of their not being themselves the creators of the perils and agitation which they would fain deprecate. He would not, he repeated, anticipate the discussion of to-morrow further than to observe, that he hoped and expected that the House would entertain that discussion in a tone harmonious with the feelings of the sound and sensible portion of the community—that is, that, while it asserted its own opinions with due regard to its own dignity, it would not be neglectful of what was due to the opinions of the other branch of the Legislature. If they were warned against proving themselves cravens to the public, he would warn them against proving themselves bullies towards the House of Lords. But of this more to-morrow. He then rose for the purpose of suggesting to the noble Lord, whether he was not bound, by usage, to explain the grounds or nature of the advice the non-reception of which by his Majesty had led to the dissolution of Earl Grey's Administration. It was not enough to state that his having tendered an advice which was not adopted led to his resignation; he was bound to state the character of that advice, and the grounds on which it was offered and rejected. He was old enough to remember, that this was the course pursued by Earl Grey himself in 1807, on his resignation of office. On that occasion that noble Earl entered into a very minute statement of all the proceedings connected with his resignation. With regard to the present resignation, they were all completely in the dark as to its causes, save what reached them in the way of public rumour, which in itself was more than usually vague — indeed amounted to nothing more than that his Majesty's advisers thought it fit to tender an advice to the King, which his Majesty did not think it fitting to adopt, and that as a consequence their resignation was tendered and accepted. It was important that they should clearly understand why it was that Ministers had resigned, the rather, as amid the cheers of one side of the House, there might be discerned something like a censure on his Majesty for having accepted their resignation. [" *No, no.*"] He was sensible of the impropriety of that House discussing questions involving the personal acts of the Sovereign, but he appealed to them, whether the announcement of the fact of resignation was not accompanied by a sort of complaint [" *no, no,*"]—at least a statement—which, in the absence of information, left them to believe that the King had rejected an advice which his advisers thought he ought to have adopted. Now, what he and those on the Opposition side of the House wanted to learn from the noble Lord was, the specific character of that advice, and of the grounds on which it was proffered and rejected. He took it for granted, when he saw hon. Members opposite so prompt and zealous in their approval of the conduct of the noble Lord and his colleagues, that they at least were possessed of this information—that they were acquainted with the nature of the advice, and as a consequence knew whether it amounted to an imperative demand for the creation of some sixty or seventy Peers, for the purpose of carrying the Reform Bill, or otherwise. It was important, if such was the case, that the House at large should be made acquainted with the particulars—that it should know whether the advice tendered to the King was not what he could not hesitate to call the most outrageous and unconstitutional which it was possible for Ministers to give. If so, he would then only say, that he very much mistook the feelings of the people of England if a very large majority of them would not be imbued with a strong feeling of gratitude towards his Majesty for so promptly accepting the resignation of those who tendered him such an advice. The Motion for to-morrow, however, of the noble member for Devon would afford them a more convenient occasion for discussing the goodness or badness, in a constitutional sense, of the advice which his Majesty had rejected: at present he would merely urge the necessity of the House being made fully acquainted with all the particulars.

Colonel *Davies* agreed with Mr. Baring—with whom, however, he differed as to the merits of the Reform Bill itself—that it was highly expedient that the House should be put in full possession of every information connected with the act which had led to the resignation of Lord Althorp and his colleagues—the more so, as it had always been understood that the King had lent them, in their plan of Reform, a most cordial support. As it was, they were completely in the dark as to this most important fact; and were left to guess, among several rumoured versions of the true facts of the case, that which was most probable. It was said by some that Earl Grey had advised the creation of fifty or seventy Peers, according to others one hundred, but that his Majesty objected to the amount. According to other versions, his Majesty did not object to a definite number, but to entrusting the noble Earl with a *carte blanche* power of creating as many as circumstances might require, and that the noble Earl being refused this unlimited power, resigned. Now, if this *carte blanche* power was the advice given by Earl Grey to the King, he would not hesitate to declare that it was an advice, or rather demand, which his Majesty ought not to have complied with, and which he was, therefore, right in peremptorily rejecting. It was highly important, he repeated, that the real facts should be made public, in order that it might be clearly seen where the blame lay.

Sir *Robert Peel* did not rise to in any wise anticipate the discussion of to-morrow, but merely to express his concurrence with Mr. Baring and Colonel Davies, that it was not only essential to that discussion, but conformable with the uniform usages of the House, that it should be put in full information of the distinct causes which had led to the resignation of Earl Grey's Government. He would not then press Lord Althorp to state what those causes were—the less so, as he was confident the noble Lord would himself, on reflection, see, that in affording the information, he would only be pursuing the usual course of his predecessors under similar circumstances—but would merely suggest to him the propriety of applying to his Majesty for permission to explain in detail the proceedings and their causes which had led to his resignation. This permission it was necessary he should obtain, as otherwise his explanation would be a violation of what was due to his Sovereign, there being evidently no acts more truly personal with respect to the Sovereign than those of the appointment or acceptance of the resignation of his Ministers. He hoped, therefore, the noble Lord would see the expediency of his explaining to Parliament and the public the real causes of his resignation.

Mr. *James* differed from Messrs. Baring and Davies as to the character of the advice to the King to create Peers in order to carry the Reform Bill. He, so far from deeming it unwise and unconstitutional, thought the best advice which the Sovereign could receive from his Ministers would be for an unlimited creation of Peers for so nationally beneficial a purpose.

Mr. *Duncombe* trusted that Lord Ebrington would persevere in his Motion for a call of the House to-morrow, as, besides that there were enough of Members in town to answer the call, it was highly expedient that the people should know who were the waverers, and who were their honest and uncompromising Representatives, which would be evident by comparing a list of those who would vote for the noble Lord's Motion, and those who had with so triumphant a majority, recorded their confidence in Ministers on the former defeat of the Bill by the House of Lords. He did not think that Lord Althorp was called upon to explain more fully the procceedings connected with his resignation than he had done. It was enough for the country to know, that in consequence of what had taken place in the other House of Parliament on Monday last, the noble Lord and his colleagues deemed it their duty to resign. [" *No, no.*"] Well, that in consequence of the adverse vote of their Lordships, that Ministers felt it right to give their advice to their Sovereign to take such steps as would secure the national bill against mutilation, and that his Majesty not acting on that advice, they had no alternative between resigning, or being auxiliaries in the work of slaughter. It was enough for the country to know that they had most honourably preferred the former course; and he trusted, in gratitude, and consistency, and justice, the people would not cease from constitutional agitation, till the power to carry the great measure of national purification into effect was restored to the hands of those who had the magnanimity to stand or fall by it, from the grasp of those who had been enabled—he trusted temporarily—to wrest it from them by means of the grossest hypocrisy and treachery.

Lord *Althorp:* I wish particularly to say, that, in what I stated to the House at first, I most carefully avoided throwing any blame on any one, and especially blame of the nature insinuated by the right hon. Baronet. I hope I so expressed myself as to guard myself from the possibility of any misconstruction. With respect to what the right hon. Baronet has said with regard to further explanations, I can only observe, that I do not feel myself authorized at present to say more than I have said. I wish it to be understood that I do not pledge myself that I shall make any further statement at any future time, but that at present I have stated all I am at present authorized to state. The hon. member for Thetford has stated the case of 1807 as an example for the present occasion. I was then a Member of this House, and I remember that what he states as then taking place is quite true. The noble Earl did make a statement of considerable length as to the causes of the resignation of himself and his colleagues, but the hon. Member will recollect that there were then circumstances which called for a full explanation, but to which there is nothing analogous in the present case. The reports which were then in existence varied much from each other. There were then imputations on the character and conduct of the Ministers, and it was necessary for them to obtain from his Majesty permission to make the statement. Such circumstances do not at present exist, and there is not in the case now, so much of complexity as on that occasion, and, therefore, I do not think myself called on to make a more detailed statement than I have done.

Mr. *Macaulay:* I should have said nothing, Sir, upon this subject, but for the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Thetford; but, in the first place, I wish to confirm my noble friend in his statement, that, in all the observations he made, there was not one single syllable that, in the slightest degree, could be construed as disrespectful to his Majesty; and, as we are on the eve of a discussion of importance, and which is likely to produce considerable agitation in the country, I protest, in the name of every Member of this House, against that unconstitutional doctrine—that doctrine so subversive of the freedom of debate—that the Members of this House, who speak with approbation of the conduct of the Ministers, or who say that they regret that the advice given by the Ministers was not adopted and acted upon, shall be construed to have spoken inconsistently with that affection which we all feel for the person, the honour, and the office, of our Sovereign. I claim the freedom of speech for myself and for all the Members of this House collectively—that freedom of speech which you, Sir, on the first day of the meeting of this Parliament, claimed for us from the King; and I demand that any remarks we may make on the change of Administration shall not be construed into the expression of any doubt that our Sovereign, in all the conduct he has pursued, has been actuated by any other motive than the most sincere and single desire to promote the good of his people. I shall now, Sir, say no more, than to entreat my noble friend to persevere in the Motion of which he has given notice.

Mr. *Baring* did not feel that what had fallen from him at all warranted the comment of Mr. Macaulay.

Lord *Milton* felt himself bound to protest against the doctrine of Sir Robert Peel, that the acceptance of a Minister's resignation, being a personal act of the Sovereign, could not be discussed in Parliament without the express permission of the King, except at the hazard of violating the prerogative. If the appointment or the resignation of a Minister were a personal act of this nature, there was an end to everything like the responsibility of Ministers to the Legislature. The Constitutional doctrine was, that the Ministers were responsible for every act of the Crown.

Sir *Robert Peel* did not mean to say, that the individual accepting office was not responsible to Parliament for his official conduct; but merely that the original act of either appointing or dismissing a Minister was a personal act of the Sovereign, which could not be discussed in detail without his permission.

Mr. *Hunt* was sure that there could be but one opinion as to the necessity of the ex-Ministers explaining fully every transaction connected with their exit from office. If Lord Grey was never promised the power to create Peers to carry the Reform Bill, it followed that he and his colleagues had for the last twelve months been imposing the grossest delusion upon the people. It was right that this important fact should be satisfactorily determined, and whether the King had at any time consented to perform what he had yesterday refused.

Lord *Ebrington* felt himself compelled

to persevere in his notice. Under ordinary circumstances he should have felt great alacrity in adopting the suggestion of his noble friend, but, under the extraordinary relations in which that House stood with respect to the Reform Bill and the country, he felt he should be abandoning his duty did he delay his Motion a single hour. It was important in such a national crisis, that the people should know who were their honest and consistent Representatives, and who had proved recreants from their duty. For the same reasons he would persevere in his Motion for a call of the House, so as to guard against backsliders and time-watchers.

Order of the Day read, and measure postponed accordingly.

Also ordered, on the Motion of Lord Ebrington, that the House be called over on the next day.

Presentation of Petitions.] Sir *Robert Peel* moved, in pursuance of the notice which he had given previous to the recess, for the appointment of a Committee to frame some regulations to facilitate the presentation of public petitions. He said, that he should suggest that something like the appointment of a Standing Committee should be resolved on, before whom any Member should be at liberty to lay whatever petitions he might be intrusted with; and that this Committee should classify such petitions, setting forth their general prayer, and stating the number of signatures attached to each. He would not, however, propose to take away the right, which every Member at present possessed, of presenting petitions to the whole House, and expressing his opinions on the subject; but he thought it would be advisable to limit each Member to one speech.

Lord *Althorp* thought some regulation on this subject was necessary, and anticipated that the right hon. Baronet's proposition would be beneficial.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, May 10, 1832.

Minutes.] Papers ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Fowell Buxton, Copies of, or Extracts from, all such Reports from Protectors of Slaves in the British Colonies as have not already been presented.

Bills read a third time.—Poor Allotment; Corn Laws Consolidation. Committed.—Uniformity of Process, and Labourers' Employment.

Reform—Corporation of London Petition.] The Sheriffs and Remembrancer of the City of London appeared at the Bar with the Petition of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, agreed to by the Common Council on Wednesday.

Mr. Alderman *Wood*, in moving that the petition be read at length, said, he was prevented by a domestic calamity from being present at the meeting at which it was got up; but the petition, he was informed, was unanimously adopted.

Petition read.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* concurred in the prayer of the petition. He thought it a great mischief to the country that the House of Lords had so conducted themselves as to interrupt the progress of the Reform Bill. He begged to add, that the state of his health had prevented his attendance as much as he could wish at public meetings of his constituents, and also in this House; but he declared his intention of being at his post at this all-important crisis.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* had attended the meeting at which the petition had been got up, and could bear testimony to the general feelings of regret and disappointment which had been felt, not only by the Corporation of London, but by all persons of every class in London, at the proceedings of the House of Lords. He felt convinced, whoever was called to his Majesty's Councils would fail to conduct the Government of the country with satisfaction to the people, and would fail to maintain public peace and tranquillity, unless the Bill, whole and entire as it was at present, was proceeded with. It was upon the Bill, as it had left the House of Commons, that the people had set their minds; and it was perfectly absurd to say that there had been anything like a re-action upon the subject of Reform. The fact was, the people had been less agitated because they had confidence in the assurance that had been given by his Majesty's Ministers that the Bill would be carried unmutilated. But the greater that confidence had been, the greater was their disappointment at the loss suffered by the King and the country in being deprived of the services of those Ministers who had inspired such general confidence. The length of time that the Bill had been under consideration had occasioned considerable stagnation in trade, especially of the retail trade, which, of course, had extended to the general branches of manufacture and commerce of the country; and he was apprehensive that at the present awful crisis commercial credit would be greatly impaired.

Mr. Alderman Venables supported the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Alderman *Hughes* said, he was present at the meeting of the Common Council, and he proposed an amendment to that part of the petition which prayed the House of Commons to refuse the Supplies until the Reform Bill was passed. It was absurd for the Common Council to recommend refusing the Supplies, and to withhold their confidence from a Government before they knew of whom that Government was to be formed. Although the petition purported to be that of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, there were only six Aldermen present, and all of them held up their hands against that part of the petition to which he alluded.

Mr. *Hunt* said, though not an Alderman or a Common Councilman, he was a liveryman. He reminded the House that the Common Council had only to attend to the municipal business of the city; the election for Members of Parliament lay with the livery. That body, the livery, were to meet to-morrow, and they would, no doubt, follow in the track already chalked out by the Common Council.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* wished to treat the Corporation with great respect, for he admired their conduct throughout the history of the country, and he thought that one of the greatest mischiefs of the Reform Bill was, that that great constituency would be degraded by having infused into it a set of vagabond 10*l.* voters.

Petition to be printed.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.] Lord *Ebrington* addressed the House nearly as follows: Sir, however reluctant I may be needlessly to take up the time of the House, I think that little apology will be required from me for doing so on the present occasion. I wish, indeed, that the duty I have ventured to undertake had been committed to abler and better hands than mine; but whatever may be the opinion of hon. Gentlemen as to the substance of the Motion which I shall have the honour to submit to the House, I think that there are few persons who will not consider that, at a crisis so momentous, and under all the circumstances of the country, this House is called upon for some expression of its feelings. And, Sir, I am happy to say, that I have not to look very far back for a precedent in the course which I am about to pursue. It must be in the recollection of many of the Gentlemen whom I am addressing, that in 1812, on the death of Mr. Perceval, Mr. Stuart Wortley, now Lord Wharncliffe, moved an humble address to the Prince Regent, praying his Royal Highness to take such measures as should enable him to form a strong and efficient Administration. In the debate which took place on that address, some Gentlemen objected to it, on the ground that it was an unconstitutional and improper interference on the part of the House of Commons with the prerogatives of the Crown; and, in reply to some observations of this sort, Mr. Canning, after stating that the interference of this House ought not in such cases to be had recourse to, except under circumstances of particular emergency, proceeded nevertheless, to vindicate the general right of the House to interfere, in these words:—"The House of Commons is a council of control, but it is likewise a council of advice; and I think the man ill read—not in your Journals, but in your Constitution—who should say that no case of such transcendant importance could exist in which it would not be competent for the Legislature, by the timely interposition of advice, to prevent the necessity of control."* These, Sir, are the words of Mr. Canning, conveying, in better and more forcible language than I can pretend to do, the feeling by which I am impelled. I beg to state that, in taking this course, I have no wish unnecessarily to embarrass the Crown in its choice of an Administration—that I have no desire to throw any obstruction in the way of his Majesty; but at the same time I cannot help feeling that nothing can be more injurious, both to the Crown and to the country, than that there should exist any misapprehension on the part of his Majesty as to the sentiments of the House of Commons, or that there should be in this House itself any doubt as to the feelings of the majority of its Members. Sir, a strong and sudden change of opinion is reported to have taken place in certain quarters, in another place, on the favour of the measure of Reform, and I do not know but that such possibly may have taken place here also, in a different sense—I mean that a change of opinion may have taken place in this House as against the Reform Bill. I do not, however, believe that such is the case; but, at all events, I am sure that it is necessary, with a view to the tranquillity and the permanence of any Administration that may be formed, and to the formation of a true estimate by the Crown and the country of the sentiments of this House, that those sentiments should be fully and completely declared. It is true that I was last night requested by my noble friend (Lord Althorp) not to make this motion: it is true that a wish has been conveyed to me by my noble friend at the head of the Government in another place, that I had not given that notice which I felt it to be my duty to give. Sir, I am perfectly aware that my two noble friends, with that modesty which, in them, almost amounts to a defect, would have been perfectly satisfied to have retired from those situations which, we all well know, how reluctantly they occupied, with no other meed of approbation—with no other approving reward, than that which they must ever find in reflecting on their own manly conduct. This, at least, remains for them, after all the toils and anxieties which they have undergone—after all the obloquy which they have suffered in the great cause of obtaining for the people a free Representation; this, I say, at least remains to them—that they will carry with them into their retirement the consolation of knowing how much they have effected in that great cause. And yet, forsooth, we are now told that they ought to have submitted to have been dragged through the humiliation of having the question—of whether Gatton and Old Sarum should still be allowed to disgrace the Representation of the country, bandied backward and forward, until the majority of the House of Lords, four-fifths of whom are composed of the opponents of all Reform, could make up their minds how small a portion of enfranchisement they would please in charity to deal out to the people. Nay, still further, they were to be dragged through the humiliation of hearing (as soon as that vote of last Monday was passed) a declaration made by one of those very opponents, who promised, not only the full measure of enfranchisement intended by the Government, but even threatened to go still further in Reform. After this, the late Ministry have at least the satisfaction of feeling that all the obstacles in the way of Reform have been actually conceded by the opponents of the measure, and that their good sense will no longer be insulted by the farce of houseless boroughs or the compulsory returns of close corporations. But I must say, that, if the Ministers had submitted to this degradation—if Lord Grey could have allowed himself to be so dragged through the measure—I for one (though I should not have shared in the imputation of insincerity which I know would have been lavished on him) should have felt that those Ministers who could be so forgetful of what they owed to their own situation, of what they owed to their own character, and of what they owed to the respect which is due to this House and to those who have supported them in the prosecution of their great measure, were totally unworthy of any confidence or support as public men. Under these circumstances, Sir, I have felt it to be my duty to propose to the House an Address, drawn up in language certainly far less strong than that which would convey the full expression of my own feelings, or, I believe, the feelings of the great majority of this House, after the change which has just taken place in his Majesty's Councils. In that Address I proceed to express to his Majesty our belief in the deep interest with which the people of this country still continue to regard the progress of the measure which has been carried through this House, and the disappointment and dismay which I conceive would pervade the country should any attempt be made to mutilate its provisions: and I conclude with imploring his Majesty, therefore, to call to his Councils only such persons as will carry into effect, unimpaired in all its essential provisions, that Bill which has already passed this House. These, Sir, are shortly the heads of the proposition which I have to make to this House. I feel that it would be useless on my part to take up the time of the House by impressing on its attention any arguments of mine in favour of this Address, because I think that Gentlemen can find much better arguments than any I can adduce in their own recorded votes, and their own observations upon so many repeated occasions in the course of this and the last Session of Parliament. I can, however, for myself state, that I feel most strongly on this subject. I can also state, that, so far as I have had an opportunity of ascertaining the feelings of those whom I have the honour to represent—so far as I have had an opportunity of ascertaining the feelings of the country at large—there has been no change—there has been no re-action. Whether there is any change, whether there is any re-action in this House, yet remains to be seen. If there is any such change here, it will surprise me not a little, but, at all events, if honourable Gentlemen have seen cause to alter the course which they have hitherto pursued—if they have seen any act on the part of the late Government inconsistent with that mode of proceeding upon which they have hitherto acted, I trust that they will at least have the manliness to stand up in their place and state their reasons openly and fairly, in order that they may be fully examined, so that his Majesty and the country may have the advantage of perfectly knowing the sentiments of this House. I have now only to thank the House for the patience with which they have listened to my remarks, and to move the following Address:—'That an humble Address be presented 'to his Majesty, humbly to represent to 'his Majesty the deep regret of this House 'at the change which has taken place in 'the Councils of his Majesty, by the re'tirement of those Ministers in whom this 'House continues to repose unaltered con'fidence; that this House, in conformity 'with the recommendation contained in 'his Majesty's gracious Speech, has framed 'and sent to the House of Lords a Bill for 'the Reform of the Representation of the 'people, by which they are convinced that 'the prerogatives of the Crown, the au'thority of both Houses of Parliament, 'and the rights and liberties of the peo'ple, would be secured. That to the pro'gress of this measure this House consi'ders itself bound to state to his Majesty, 'that his subjects are looking with the 'most intense interest and anxiety; and 'they cannot disguise from his Majesty 'their apprehension that any successful 'attempt to mutilate or impair the effici'ency of the Bill will be productive of 'great disappointment and dismay. That 'this House is, therefore, impelled, by the 'warmest attachment to his Majesty's 'person, humbly but most earnestly, to 'implore his Majesty to call to his Coun'cils such persons only as will carry into 'effect, unimpaired in all its essential pro'visions, that Bill for reforming the Re'presentation of the people which has re'cently passed this House.'

---

* Hansard's Debates, Vol. xxiii. p. 267.—It may, perhaps, be observed here, without impropriety, as it may spare the time of those who may seek, as the editor did, for Lord Ebrington's quotation in the collected speeches of Mr. Canning, that the speech from which it is taken, is omitted in that collection.

Mr. *Strutt:* In rising to second this Address to his Majesty, I feel that I should be betraying the interests of my constituents if I did not give the Motion of my noble friend my warmest support. In one respect, too, I may say that I am fully qualified to second this Motion, because I believe I may assert that there is no Member in this House more unconnected with, or more independent of, the late Administration, than myself; and that no man has given a vote in favour of that great measure which is so identified with the late Government, with less of a party feeling than I have. I feel that it would be an unpardonable waste of the time of the House, were I, on the present occasion, to enter on that great question which has so long been under the discussion of Parliament. It is enough for my present purpose to remark, that this great measure of Reform was recommended from the Throne—that it was proposed to this House by his Majesty's Government—that it was received by the great body of the people with universal approbation, and has since continued to be sanctioned by their more deliberate approval; and lastly, that it has passed through this House, supported by a great majority of its Members. Now, therefore, that this Bill is in the greatest jeopardy, and liable to mutilation, if not to absolute destruction, I cannot believe that there is a Member in this House so lost to the duty which he owes to his constituents as to feel the least hesitation in coming forward, and declaring, in the most solemn manner, his firm and steady adherence to those principles which for the last eighteen months we have been labouring to enforce and establish. But, Sir, there is yet another object before us. There is a duty which we also owe to the authors of this measure—a measure so honourable to themselves, and to carry which through this and the other House of Parliament, they have laboured with so much indefatigable zeal. If, on a former occasion, we thought it necessary to sanction the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers by a vote of confidence, I cannot believe that the House will on this occasion hesitate to repeat a similar, or even still more strong vote of approbation, now that they have given us the strongest proof of their attachment to those principles which have been adopted by this House. Sir, his Majesty's late Ministers have quitted office; but they still retain that which must be far more valuable in their own eyes, as well as in those of the country at large—they retain their principles uncompromised, and their character unsullied: they carry with them the affection and respect of the people, and they possess (as I trust the vote of this night will show) the undeviating confidence of this House. I am aware that the Ministers are charged with having retired unnecessarily from office, and that the matter on which they retired was more a point of form than a point of principle as regards the Bill. But even if I were disposed to admit this for the sake of argument—which, by the way, I do not—then, I say, what are we to think of the conduct of those who, professing the greatest zeal in favour of Reform—who, aware that the Ministers considered this matter not as a point of form, but of most vital principle—who, themselves believing that it was matter of form, and therefore unimportant—what, I say, are we to think of the conduct of those persons who have thought fit to leave the Government in a minority, thus endangering, upon a mere point of form, not only the great measure itself, but the very peace and tranquillity of the whole country? But, Sir, I deny that this was a point of form. It was a point of principle, and of most essential principle. The question was, whether disfranchisement was good in itself—whether that system of nomination which is now so deservedly odious to the whole country, was to be openly condemned by the Bill, or only considered as subsidiary to the question of enfranchisement—and whether an excuse was to be afforded to the opponents or to the lukewarm friends (which is much the same thing) of the Bill, to cause diminution in those schedules on which, I believe, the feelings and hopes of the people are chiefly fixed. Under these circumstances, I think that there can be but one opinion among all consistent Reformers—that the Ministers have acted in the only way in which they could act. Had they done otherwise, I, for one, should have thought that they were neglecting their duty to their Sovereign, and that they were unworthy of the confidence of this House and of the country. A good deal has been said on other occasions respecting the state of the public mind on this subject; and I have heard it asserted that a re-action has taken place. Indeed I remember, that twelve months ago it was stated by the opponents of the measure, that the opinion of the people had taken a turn, and was decided against the Bill; and yet, within a few short weeks from that time, a large portion of those very Gentlemen were ejected from their seats by that very people who, it was said, were against this measure of Reform. If, at the present moment, there is any one who is blind enough to suppose that such a re-action has taken place, I believe that he will discover, from the conduct of the country on this momentous occasion, that he is most grievously mistaken—of course each Member can only speak for that part of the country with which he is more peculiarly connected. With respect to that portion of England with which I am acquainted, I can say, that not only has no re-action taken place within the last year, but the public feeling on the subject has increased considerably in intensity. If, Sir, any change has taken place, it is, that the people, having been wearied by protracted delays, and having been enraged by repeated disappointments, there is now beginning to exist among them a feeling of irritation and distress—a feeling which naturally and necessarily arises, but which must be viewed by every friend of public tranquillity with apprehension, and with a wish that it was in his power to allay and remove it. But if on this occasion it is to be held forth to the people that their hopes are to be frustrated—that the Bill is either to be mutilated in its details, or to be altogether destroyed in its principles, by being handed over to the adversaries of the measure—then, knowing as much as I do of the state of the popular feeling on the subject, I must say, that I look at the coming prospect with the greatest apprehension and dismay. There is one remedy, however, which it is in our power to apply, and that remedy consists in this, that the House at this crisis act with wisdom, firmness, and decision. Let this House come forward and place itself at the head of the people. Let this House show itself true to its former professions; let it show to the people that as long as they are true to themselves, this House will not desert them; and that instead of looking for leaders elsewhere, they have only to look to the ranks of the Reformers in this House for their real and natural supporters; and then, indeed, we may be able to feel the greatest confidence, not only that all may still be safe, but that it may yet be within our power to carry this measure to a triumphant termination. Before I sit down, there is one part of the Motion upon which I wish to say a few words. That which I consider as far the most important portion of the Address is that in which we implore his Majesty to call to his Councils none but those who are known friends of the principles which this House has supported, and on which the hopes of the country are fixed. It would be worse than idle to suppose that the majority of this House, if they have the least regard for their character, their professions, or their constituents, can think of giving their support to an Administration composed of persons who, though they may be sincere in their opinion, we have heard within the last twelve months contesting at one time the vital principles of the Bill, and at another cavilling for weeks and months together at its details. It is impossible that the people can be satisfied with a state of things like this. If, indeed, the time shall ever come when we are willing to intrust our victorious armies to the command of the officers of the enemy—if we shall ever call the culprits from the bar to the judgment seats—then, and not till then, will I consent to intrust the construction and management of this Bill to those who have shown themselves its avowed enemies, or its reluctant and wavering supporters. Sir, it is on these grounds that I have risen to second this Motion. I am convinced that it is necessary, not only for the sake of that great measure to which we are pledged, but even for the peace, tranquillity, and welfare, of the best interests of the country, that this House should now come forward with some Resolution of this kind; and I conceive that the Address of my noble friend exactly expresses that which it is the duty of this House to adopt. He expresses our cordial support of the Bill—our confidence in the late Administration—and, above all, it beseeches his Majesty not to call any men to his Councils who are not the known friends of that great measure. For these reasons I most cordially second the Motion.

Mr. *Baring* said, his first object in rising was, to ascertain from the noble Lord opposite whether it was his intention to make any further communication on the resignation of Ministers than he had given last night. He was the more anxious to ascertain that, because the advice which had been given, and rejected, formed necessarily the only topic of the debate for the night. The House, in fact, could not well go on with the discussion, unless they knew from the Ministers the cause of their resignation. He would, therefore, put it to the noble Lord opposite whether he was authorised to give any further explanation; and in case he did not rise, the House might take it for granted that he had nothing further to explain—(the hon. Member paused for a few seconds, and, on no reply being given, he proceeded.) Well, as no answer was given, the House must take it for granted that no further explanation was to be given, and the House must remain in the same state of ignorance as before.—For his part, he must declare that he was entirely ignorant of the cause which had led to the extraordinary resignation. He only stated what were his sincere sentiments. He did not see why such a statement need excite the laughter of Gentlemen opposite. He must further say, that he did not think what had passed between the Sovereign and his Ministers was a fair subject for an Address to the Crown. Many Gentlemen differed on the subject; one was of one opinion, and another of another; but, unless Goverment chose to be more communicative, he thought it was quite impossible to enter on the discussion of the transaction. He had every possible respect for the noble Lord at the head of the Administration. He had the sincerest respect for his character and abilities, and no one doubted that, in bringing forward that great change in the Representation, the noble Lord was actuated solely by the good of his country. He thought the country would also give those who opposed the measure credit for what they had done. He thought the country would not suppose them to be such absurd idiots, as, for the sake of personal interests, to oppose a measure which, in their hearts, they believed to be for the good government, good order, and security of the country [*A laugh and cheers from the "Opposition."*] If the hon. Gentlemen opposite thought proper to interrupt him while speaking, and put a different construction on his words from what he himself intended, he could not help it, and was not afraid of that construction. If their opposition had been imputed to personal motives, he would only ask those who made such an imputation to look to the fact, that almost all the Members of Government opposite had been opposed to Reform, except the noble Lord (Lord John Russell); and that there was hardly a public man in the country, and more particularly in the King's Councils, who had not at one time or another been opposed to such a sweeping measure of Reform as that introduced by his Majesty's Government. He would not, however, enter on the subject of Reform; but he could not help making these remarks, in order to defend himself, and those with whom he acted, from the attacks which had been repeatedly and undeservedly made on them. If the noble Lord who brought forward the Motion were to look well to the question—if he were to consider the position of the three branches of the Legislature—if he were to look to the position of the Crown, the position of the House of Lords, and the position of the Commons, he was sure that it was a subject of the most awful consideration, and one which, unless he was prepared to give all power to the Commons, he ought to have maturely weighed before he had brought it under the consideration of the House. The hon. Gentleman, the member for Derby, who spoke last, seemed to think that the House of Commons should do every thing—he thought the opposition to the measure was factious and selfish—he underrated the motives of those who opposed it—in short, the speech of the hon. member for Derby implied that the House of Commons was every thing—that the people who sent them there were to have the sole control—and that King and Lords were to be put out of the question. Now, he was bound to say, that the people, in his opinion, had no small share already in the Constitution of the country, and in controlling the influence of the Crown, and that the present House of Commons afforded a tolerable proof of what might be expected from a Reformed Parliament. It was impossible, however, to look at that Bill, as a whole, without some apprehension that its tendency would be to destroy that balance of the Constitution which was so necessary to the safety and peace of the country. He would not, however, as he had already said, enter into any details on the measure itself. He would take it for granted that it was a proper Bill, and that it was the bounden duty of the Peers to further its progress through Parliament, and finally present it to the Crown. Well, taking that for granted, what did the noble Lord who made the Motion call on the House to do? Why, to address the Crown on the Bill which had passed through the Commons triumphantly, and which was in progress through the other House, when it was stopped by the extraordinary conduct of the Government. Here it was impossiable for him not to bear testimony to the admirable conduct and the good temper of the noble Lord opposite (the Chancellor of the Exchequer); and, with all respect to the nobleman at the head of the Government, he must say that, had he had the same good temper and forbearance, the country would not be in its present state. He again asked, what was the object of the Address? and what were the facts on which it was founded? The House had passed the Bill, and sent it to the Lords; and, though it might be irregular to allude to that House, he trusted he should be permitted to do so for the present, as, without such a licence, the discussion could not go on, as the whole case rested on that point. Well, on the Bill being sent up to the Peers, various discussions took place; and, though hon. Gentlemen opposite, who supported the Government, had repeatedly asserted that they would have the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill, the noble Earl, the First Lord of the Treasury, stated—and he looked on that as a good sign, boding that the Lords would be treated as an independent body—the noble Earl declared, that he presented the Bill for the consideration of their Lordships—that he would be ready to listen to arguments for any alteration in the Bill; but, if the great principles were touched, he could not for a day remain in office. Now, he would appeal to the House and to the country whether any one great principle of the Bill had been touched, and whether, that being the case, the Ministry were justified in adopting a course which had thrown the country into its present state. The state of the country, in fact, was such that no man could shut his eyes to it. Why, it was in such a state that tumultuous assemblies were everywhere to be seen, and he had himself heard some people this morning venturing to cry out, "No King, and Cromwell for ever." Why, it was impossible to have the Ministers of the Crown setting their own master, as it were, at defiance; and appealing to the mob, without seeing that such a course of things must lead to consequences the most serious. Nothing could justify the Ministers in putting the country into such a state, in embroiling it in such a manner. Certainly not a mere difference between them and their master—no mere ordinary possibility that an alteration in the Bill might take place at some future time—nothing of that sort could justify them; and any ordinary person must have seen that nothing but the certainty of great danger could have justified them in throwing the country into such a state of confusion as it was in now. When the noble Lord asked them to address the King, in order to ask his Majesty not to select for his Ministers any but those who would pass the Bill in what he seemed to consider its present state of purity, did he not go too far? He thought the noble Lord was going too far, notwithstanding the moderate language in which his Motion was worded; and he had often observed, that, on occasions of this sort, the humility of the language was generally proportioned to the arrogance of the matter. What was really meant by this Address was, to tell his Majesty that he had lost Ministers which that House desired he would take back again, [*cheers*]. He collected from the cheers of hon. Gentlemen opposite that they did put that interpretation upon the Address, and that the Crown was to be told, that, as far as that House could go, and as far as the Lord Mayor who had presented the petition of the City of London could go, in acting up to the recommendations of discreditable associations—and discreditable he would call them, notwithstanding their situation; because they had associated themselves with the principles of discreditable associations—it must have no other Ministers. The plain English of the Address was, to instruct the Crown to take back the Ministers. How was the Crown to take them back? It was not the Crown who discharged the Ministers; they had given notice that they would not serve the Crown. Was the King to go on his knees and beg them to return to office? He did not overstate his view of the case in saying this. He could read the plain English and plain operation of this Address in no other way than that which he had stated: and when it was presented, supposing it to be disregarded, if it was, as it was likely to be—if the independence of the Crown was anything, if the independence of the Peerage was anything, and if all the power in the country was not to be vested in the clubs brawling without—surely, if that House passed such an Address, and it was rejected, that House would be lessening the value of that advice which could not be rejected by the Crown without the most serious consequences. But suppose that Address was passed, and the Crown said, that it was ready to do what the Address required, but that it could not make men serve who did not choose to do so? Why, the noble Lord, in telling them of his resignation, had said, that the Crown had been graciously pleased to accept the resignation; and now that House was asked to tell the Crown that the Commons wished the Crown to be graciously pleased to give it back again. If Gentlemen would for a moment abandon their abstract views upon questions like this, and would look at them more with a view to the vital interests of the country—especially those Gentlemen who said that they were so anxious about preserving the purity of the Constitution—they would see the danger of agreeing to an Address which was not a humble Address, but a positive mandate to the Crown. Were they to tell the King to call these Ministers together again at the same time that he might think that the measure which they recommended was hostile to the interests of the country? Why, how stood the case with regard to the Bill? The first proposal made to touch the Bill, was one that had never been carried into effect; that was really a proposal of some importance—it was to take out of schedule A the figures of fifty-six. But by whom was that proposal made? Was it by the opponents of the measure? No such thing. It was by the Ministers themselves. The second proposal came undoubtedly from a noble Lord supposed to be hostile to the general principle of the Bill. He proposed to postpone the schedule A, and to go in the first instance to the enfranchisement clause—that was the noble Lord's proposition; and he put it to every candid man, whether there was anything in that hostile to the principle of the Bill? That supposition of hostility might exist, in the suspicious mind of the noble Lord who had proposed the Address, and of the hon. Gentleman who had seconded it, who had spoken in such a manner that it seemed they thought the House of Lords should not touch the Bill at all; but even if that suspicion were well founded—if they were right in believing that the Opposition did not act with fair intentions, still the Government did go into the Committee; and what after that was it that made the Government go to the Crown and break up the Administration? Surely it could not be the proposal of the noble Lord he had alluded to. Why, that very proposition was made in the House of Commons, and the noble Lord opposite then said, that it was a very unimportant matter, and observed that he did not think it at all important whether they began with the enfranchisement or disfranchisement, but as the Bill was drawn up with the disfranchisement clause first, they had better go on with it as it was. Surely the noble Lord was an authority for saying that he did not consider that proposal as one of direct hostility to the Bill. When they had passed to the consideration of the enfranchisement clauses, it was not as if they had rejected the whole Bill; and when the noble Lord went down to call for the interference of the Crown, in such a way as to shake the nerves of every man in the country, if he had taken forty-eight hours to ascertain whether the Peers were sincere or not, he would not have done so. If the noble Earl at the head of the Government had thought as the noble Lord opposite had done, he would have said, that that change in the order of considering the clauses of the Bill was a matter of no consequence. If the noble Earl had permitted that proposition to be carried into effect, and the House of Lords had not afterwards passed schedule A, still the Bill would have been entirely in their hands; but he supposed that that which the noble Earl wanted in this instance would, in a Reformed Parliament, be the new improved patent steam-engine way of passing a bill through the Lords, if, indeed, the House of Lords still continued in possession of any power. He meant that what the noble Earl had done amounted to saying to the House of Lords —"We will not trust you—you mean to take us in;" but if the noble Earl did think so, still they could not take the Bill out of his own hands; yet, in the most reckless manner, though forty-eight hours would have put to the test whether the supposed deceptive disposition of the Peers was such as it was supposed to be, the noble Earl hurried to ask for the interference of the Crown, and that interference being refused, broke up the Administration. They seemed to require that the passion for Reform which existed among some classes, should be equally powerful every where, and that all the Peers in the House of Lords should be Reformers, as all the people elsewhere were said to be. It was impossible to say what were the motives that had actuated the Peers in the conduct they had pursued, but to judge from what he knew, he must say, that he believed that the real feeling of most of the Peers was a strong dislike to the general principle of the Bill. He would go further and say, that not only those who formed the majority, but that two-thirds or three-fourths of the minority were of the same opinion. In every measure there were two things to be considered—not only what was desirable but what was practicable. No man could sit down and make a perfect constitution; but it was the part of a wise man to come as near it as the feelings and opinions of the country in which he lived would permit him. A great portion of that enlightened body who filled the seats of the other House of Parliament—and no person could look at the debate upon the Reform Bill and not see that whatever might be the merits of popular Representation, there was no want of talent in the hereditary branch of the Legislature—he said that no man could doubt that a great portion of that enlightened body were of the opinion he had described. Every one must agree that no one could permanently live in a country in hostility to the opinions of the great majority of the people of that country; and certainly he meant to say, that a large portion of the people of property and intelligence in the country were very timid on the subject of Reform. He could assure the House, that in what he was now saying he was speaking his sincere opinion, and he had opportunities of judging of the fact he asserted, for he passed a considerable portion of his time in giving advice to people how they should dispose of their property, and he could assure the House that among such people there was a great deal of hesitation on the subject of the Reform Bill. If Gentlemen would take the opinions of those who were in the habit of considering their opinions—he meant of lawyers and physicians, who might be properly said to be the well-instructed classes of the community, and he might add, that they could not well take a better instance of the opinions of the instructed classes than by looking at the two Universities—it was his opinion that they would find full three-fourths of these classes adverse to the present Bill, and of the other fourth one-half at least looked with great anxiety to the result, as men looked for the termination of a dangerous experiment. He admitted that there was a portion of the people eager for Reform, and that so great was that portion who he might say were eager for Reform, that it would neither be safe nor consistent with the peace and tranquillity of the country not to give every consideration to the substantive opinion of that portion of the people. His notion of the conduct of the House of Peers was, that they, entertaining the opinion which he honestly believed was entertained by the educated and wealthy portion of the community, and saw the difficulty of preserving the Constitution, if they gave way to the desires of what he admitted to be the preponderating mass of the people. The Bill had passed the House of Commons; it was supported by a large portion of the Aristocracy, who—he would not say for the sake of maintaining themselves in power, but he would suppose from the conviction of the necessity and propriety of the measure—had joined the class he had alluded to, and then it went up to the House of Peers. When it got into the House of Peers, the Peers said that it was a Bill, a great portion of which must be passed, not for the purpose of making the Constitution better, but because it was required by a considerable body among the people; and his opinion was, that the House of Lords would have passed that key-stone of the arch, and then, that if the Bill had been suffered quietly to proceed on its course, and the enfranchisement clauses had been considered first, and the disfranchisement clauses afterwards, they would have been passed by the Lords, not with the conviction that they would improve the condition of the country, but that they were necessary to the peace and tranquillity of the country. Under these circumstances, he repeated what he had said before, that the noble Earl at the head of the Government should have waited for forty-eight hours, and so put to the test the sincerity of the House of Peers; but no, for on the first attempt of the House of Lords to make any change in the order of proceeding, the Ministers in a pet threw up their situations, after applying to the Crown for its interference. He thought that was wrong. The noble Lord, however, who moved the Address told the House, that it was beneath the dignity of Earl Grey to be dragged into the questions of Gatton and Old Sarum; but that, the noble Lord must allow him to say, seemed quite beside the question before the House. He, therefore, again insisted that they ought to know what was the advice given to the Crown that the Crown had thought fit to reject, and the rejection of which had induced the Government to resign? At present they knew nothing of it but from mere rumour, though he must honestly say, that he believed that advice was to create Peers, though whether the number of Peers desired was thirty or forty, or what it was, he was quite unable to guess. He was unwilling, however, to give credit to his own supposition, for, till the fact came before the public, he would not believe that the nobleman who had passed through life in the distinguished manner in which the noble Earl at the head of the Government had done, or the noble Lords and hon. Gentlemen opposite, who formed part of his Administration, would have proposed to the Crown to make the number of Peers supposed. He was especially unwilling to credit the rumour which the hon. member for Worcester had last night said he had heard, that the Ministers had asked for power to create as many Peers as they pleased or might think necessary to carry the Bill. If the Peers and the country knew that that was the remedy proposed to be adopted, in order to get a law that had passed the House of Commons carried through the House of Lords, it must much affect their opinion, and the opinion of the people of the firmness of the Crown on this occasion. The object of all these meetings, that it was now so much the fashion to hold, was to induce people to believe that, the King having supported the measure of Reform to some extent, had in fact, bound himself to support it to the full extent to which it was now wished to be carried, and it was supposed that the King had changed his mind on the subject. It was impossible surely for the noble Lord to leave the King under the imputation under which he was now left by the noble Lord refusing to give the House a statement of the advice which the Ministers had offered to the King, and which, his Majesty having rejected, became the cause of their resignation. The address of the City begged that his Majesty would do what was necessary to carry the Bill. That which was necessary to carry the Bill was a question that would be differently answered in the minds of different people. He knew that there were some persons who would say, that as the Bill affected the popular Representation, the House of Lords ought to have nothing to do with it. Was that principle to constitute the ground of their Address to his Majesty? [*"Hear, hear," from an hon. Member.*"] He thought from that most unconstitutional cheer that there was at least one hon. Member in that House who thought so. There was another doctrine on this subject, on which he should say one word, and that was a doctrine put forth by his Majesty's Solicitor-General for Ireland, who had said, that it would be perfectly competent to the Crown to require no Act of Parliament on this occasion, but to send writs to the towns that ought to have Representatives; and if they were to be told that, and then to be told that the Crown had refused to do what was necessary, they ought to know what that was; whether it was a refusal to create Peers, or to adopt the devices and shifts to which he had alluded. In theory he knew they did not talk of the King's acts; but, practically, he asserted that it was now a direct question between the King in person and his Ministers in this one transaction, in which *ex necessitate rei* the Crown performed a personal act of Government. It was said last night, by the right hon. Baronet near him, that the Crown must perform a personal act of Government in the appointment of the Ministers; and if the choice of a new Ministry was a personal act of the Crown, the dismissal of the old Ministry was so too; for, to suppose that the King would take the Counsels of the new Ministry in the dismissal of the old Ministry was to suppose an act of insincerity on the part of the Crown. He thought that that would hardly be said of any Sovereign, and least of all of his present Majesty, for all must agree, that wherever the King had given his confidence, whether to the Duke of Wellington or to Earl Grey, confidence had never been given in a more frank and open manner than by him. He put it, therefore, to any hon. Member to say, whether, in fact, if not in theory, the transaction which they were now considering was not one that involved the character and conduct of the King; and he insisted, that they ought to have an explanation of the transaction from the noble Lord, that they ought to know what advice it was, that the King rejected, so as to be able to judge whether the Ministers were justified in making that rejection the ground of their resignation. That the King had not refused their advice on any slight grounds every body must be convinced; and it therefore became doubly important that the House should know what that advice was which had been rejected. He would not ask whether any Gentleman (divesting himself of the passion which the agitation of a question of so much importance might have excited) could put his hand upon his heart, and say that he considered himself justified in voting for an Address which, whatever might be said by the Gentlemen opposite, and by the partisans of the Ministry, cast a direct reflection upon the honour and sincerity of the King; he asked, would any Gentleman put his hand upon his heart, and say that he felt himself justified in voting for such an Address without a particle of information having been given as to what was the cause of difference between his Majesty and his advisers? It behoved the House, under the circumstances, so far as it was aware of them, not to establish a precedent which must have a most serious effect upon the future prospects of this country. Undoubtedly, as the noble Lord had said, this was an occasion when the House was especially called on to do its duty manfully and consistently; but it could not do so without the fullest information. They must consider that they were arguing on constitutional grounds, and they should take care to divest themselves of all personal feelings, in order to be quite sure that they were not about to establish a precedent most mischievous in its tendency. He did not mean to say, that the House had not a right to come to this vote; but they were entitled to the clearest explanation of circumstances, before any one was justified in calling on them to assent to such a proposition. It was very easy to cast insinuations, and in the present day of throwing dirt, it required no great courage to do so. These were not the days of the Hampdens and the Russells, when, if a man cast the slightest reflection on the King, he walked out of the House into the Tower. On the contrary, these were times when they ought rather to strengthen the Crown and the authorities of the country, not so much for the sake of the Crown and the authorities as for the sake of the true liberties of the people; for he maintained that the authority of the Crown was the safeguard of the people. It was impossible to look upon what was passing around them, without observing how the King himself, and all the branches of the royal family were treated in this country—with what avidity every libel was got up—that even the highest person of the other sex—a person whose sex (to say nothing of the dignity of her station) ought to be a shelter and protection, was attacked by every base and cowardly writer, who was able, anonymously, to spit forth his venom in the daily papers; and these things passed unheeded, not only by the community, but even by the Attorney General, and the other law-officers of the Crown. Nor were these things confined to England, for, in France, when the King was nearly run over by the wilful intention of a cab-driver, a fine of *5l.* on the man was thought a sufficient punishment. When they looked at those things, and compared them with the treatment which the royal family of France experienced just before the revolution, they must say, that this was not a time for them to cast upon the King the imputations which the Address was intended to convey. He would put it to those who thought with him, that the authority which was vested in the Crown under that Constitution which was the best calculated to protect the liberties of the people of any system of Government that ever existed in the world ought to be maintained, whether this was a time for the House of Commons to throw its weight into the scale against the authority of the Crown, and the privileges of the House of Lords? Mr. Burke, speaking of times to which many occurrences of the present day bore some analogy, said—"We live under a mixed Government, in which the elements seemed to be fraught with each other's destruction; but they were not. Sometimes the democratic branch was apparently threatening the royal or aristocratic; at others, the latter encroached upon the former. But the Constitution possessed an inherent adjusting power, which soon restored the balance of both, in enabling the wary statesman now to throw his weight on the democratic, now on the regal side, according as either preponderated." He would ask again, therefore, whether, in the position in which the country was placed, was that House called on to present an Address to the Crown, such as the noble Lord opposite had proposed? In the first place, he would insist that, from what had passed in the House of Lords, there was no necessity for the measure which it was supposed had induced the Ministers to resign. The Government could have put the question to a certain test, by which it could have been clearly decided, whether or not they wanted Peers to secure the passing of the Reform Bill. But if the House would consider the extreme nature of the remedy which the Ministers proposed to apply, it would allow, that if such a remedy could be justified at all, it could only be justified by some positive act of the majority of the House of Lords, most inimical to the Reform Bill. Again, he would call their attention to the fact, that the King was consistently friendly to the Bill, and that he was known not to have the slightest objection to any part of it; and he would ask, must it not be acknowledged that the King had a right to say to his Ministers under such circumstances, "You give me advice, which I cannot follow." When it was upon such grounds the noble Lords opposite took the extreme step of tendering their resignation, surely the House was bound to say to them, that they ought to have continued for some time longer to give the King that confidence to which the whole of his conduct entitled him, and that they ought to have waited for a case of positive necessity before they deserted him. Surely they ought not to cast upon him at that time (as they expressly did by their conduct, and as did also the Address now proposed to the House) the imputation of insincerity. The course which he felt it to be his duty to take was directly to negative the Motion of the noble Lord. He had expected that another course would have been adopted by that noble Lord, and that some proposition would have been brought forward on the general question of the Reform Bill, in which the House, having twice passed that Bill, could concur. But he did not expect to hear a proposition made that the House should pass a direct censure upon the conduct of the King; for the Ministers had not been discarded by him. He had not withdrawn his confidence from them. It was they who withdrew their counsel and services from him. He trusted that the House would show towards the King, in any Address which might be voted, that respect and confidence which, he was sure, was most congenial with the feelings of the whole country. He trusted, at all events, that until some one of the Gentlemen opposite should have given an explanation of the causes which led them to retire from office, the House would directly negative any such Motion as the present.

Lord *Althorp* spoke to the following effect:—The hon. Gentleman has said, that he is ignorant of the causes which has induced us to retire from office, and that he cannot imagine what was the nature of the advice which we gave to the King; and yet, throughout the whole of his speech it was evident that he was aware of the cause, as is every other Gentleman in this House. No one can be ignorant, after the statement which I made here last night; and the whole course of the hon. Gentleman's argument was such as to show that he was aware of it. I stated last night, that the advice which we gave was occasioned by our finding that it was impossible to carry the Reform Bill. We, therefore, Sir, asked his Majesty to enable us to take such steps as were necessary to carry the Bill; and to carry it where, Sir? Why, in the House of Lords. That was the statement which I made last night. But as my hon. friend does not think that was enough, I have no objection to state, for his better satisfaction, that the advice which we thought it our duty to offer to his Majesty was, that he should create a number of Peers sufficient to enable us to carry the Reform Bill through the other House of Parliament in an efficient form. Now, Sir, my hon. friend, in the course of his argument, has referred to what took place in the other House of Parliament, and he has very truly said, that, it is impossible to discuss the present question without referring to what took place there. I agree with him that we must take it into consideration; but he says that it was a mere question of form. Now, Sir, I last night expressly admitted, that it was not a question of the greatest importance. Yet it was plain to my noble friends, and to every man in the House, that, after what occurred in the House of Lords it would be impossible to carry the Bill; for, by the decision of a majority of that House the Bill was taken out of the hands of my noble friends. It was no longer under their control or management, but was put into the hands of those who were in principle opposed to it. We had, therefore, but one of two courses to pursue—either to tender our resignations to his Majesty, or to call on him for powers which would place my noble friends in a situation in which they could carry the Bill in an efficient form. They adopted the latter alternative; and I say, Sir, that they were not to be blamed. They could do no other. But, Sir, when I say this, am I to be told, that I throw blame upon the King. On the contrary, although I think that it was my duty to act as I did, yet I have no right, and I have no wish, to throw blame on any person whatever. My hon. friend says, that we "fly in the face of our master." But, Sir, I would ask my hon. friend, does he think that language which it is fitting for a Representative of the people to address to a Minister of the Crown—and in the House of Commons? Is this the way in which my hon. friend would advise Ministers to discharge their duty under a great responsibility? Is this the way that hon. Gentlemen opposite would have us carry on the business of the country? But, Sir, I think very differently. I think that, when we found that we could not effect what we considered to be essential to the interests of the country, we should not have discharged our duty if we had not at once laid our resignations at the foot of our master, and asked him to dispense with our services, when we conceived that they could no longer be useful to the country. Was it a proper course for the hon. member for Thetford to bring before the House a discussion of the conduct which his Majesty thought proper to pursue. For my part, I shall be no party to the adoption of such a proceeding. I feel, as I stated yesterday, that, through the whole course of our Administration, his Majesty acted towards us so as to entitle him to the deepest gratitude on our parts. It would not become us to cast any imputation upon his Majesty. If we did so, or if we were to be parties to anything having a tendency to that effect, we should be guilty of the greatest ingratitude. The House will recollect that, some time ago, I stated in this place, that we should not hold office longer than we saw a reasonable probability of carrying the Reform Bill. We have redeemed that pledge. When we found that there was not a probability that we should be able to carry the Bill in an efficient manner, we did the only thing which, as honest men, we could do, and we respectfully tendered our resignations to his Majesty. As I have already mentioned to the House, I really should have wished that my noble friend had not brought forward the present Motion. But, Sir, I deny that the hon. Gentleman opposite has a right to say that the Motion of my noble friend is intended to force the King to take us back into his councils. The Motion is such as might naturally be made by a person eager to secure the success of the Bill. That measure has proceeded now to an advanced stage. It is still in existence; and I am happy to state that the step which has been taken respecting it by a majority of the House of Lords was such, that, although it obliged us to adopt the course which we have taken, still it leaves it in the power of any other Government to carry the measure through in a perfect form. It is desirable for those who are anxious for the success of the measure—at least it is not an unnatural course for them to pursue—to call on this House to address his Majesty to pray that he will be pleased to form an Administration so as to secure the ultimate success of the measure in a perfect form. This is not a Motion to force us back into office. For, on the contrary, seeing what took place in the other House, it is possible for his Majesty to form such an Administration as would be able to carry the Bill in the way in which we proposed to carry it. There is nothing in the Motion to justify my hon. friend (Mr. Baring) in saying that it tends to force the King to recal us. This, Sir, is a topic to which I should not have chosen to refer; but, in consequence of the observation which the hon. Gentleman who last sat down made in allusion to us, I thought it necessary to explain myself thus early in the debate.

Mr. *Hume* said, that, having interrupted the hon. member for Thetford in a manner which he must certainly admit to be somewhat disorderly, he was anxious to explain himself. He agreed with the hon. Member that the subject of the Address moved by the noble Lord opposite was of the utmost importance to the best interests of the nation. He agreed with him that the late Ministers were bound to explain to the House the grounds on which they had taken the important step to which the Address alluded; and he was satisfied that, in what had fallen from the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as full an explanation had been given as the House could expect; and he was satisfied that—come when the fullest information might—the country would see that the Ministers had behaved as became men of honour, and that the people would look up to them with confidence and esteem. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baring) had said, that, there were three powers in the State—the King, the Lords, and the House of Commons—but he forgot the people. The hon. Gentleman said, that it was the duty of that House to support the Constitution of King, Lords, and Commons, which he (Mr Baring) considered to be the most felicitous that ever existed, and the best calculated to protect the liberties and interests of the people. But for his part, he (Mr. Hume) looked to something more than names. It was too much the fashion to appeal to names, and to divert attention from facts. Look to the results of the felicitous Constitution. Look to the country at this moment. Sunk in the deepest poverty—bowed to the earth under an enormous debt, and groaning under unparalleled evils. Were these the results to which the hon. Gentleman would refer in proof of the unrivalled excellence of the system. There were many things to be seen in the Constitution more than were comprehended in the one view which the hon. member for Thetford took of it. The hon. Member had spoken of the good sense and intelligence and property of the kingdom as being opposed to the Reform Bill. Look throughout the country, and say, was there ever a greater libel cast upon the people of England than that assertion of the hon. Gentleman? Were not all the good sense, and intelligence, and the greatest part of the property of the kingdom unanimously in favour of the Bill? The hon. Gentleman had talked of "throwing dirt," and complained of aspersions which had been cast upon noble persons in the other House, but was there no dirt thrown upon others? Who was it that threw dirt upon the people? Did not the hon. Member call them the "brawlers without?" and was it fit that they should be spoken of in that way? Was it becoming that a Representative of the people, or one supposed to be sent to that House to represent them, and to watch over their interests, should cast dirt upon them, and asperse them? The hon. Gentleman had said, that there were three estates — King, Lords, and Commons. Granted. But were not the Commons the people? Was not that House the people? [*a laugh.*] Did they not represent the people? He could very well understand the laugh, for he knew, as they all knew, that the majority of the hon. Gentlemen around him were not Representatives of the people; and it was, therefore, that he wished to see the Reform Bill carried, in order that all the Members of that House should be Representatives of the people, not the nominees of noble persons in the other House. The hon. Gentleman had talked of their duty to the Crown. But he would say, that, if they owed a duty to the Crown, the duty was reciprocal. The Crown and the Peers owed a duty to the people. The people were not to be shared out of all power in the State, nor were their rights and interests to be sacrificed to the other two estates. But he did not wonder that they were sacrificed when he saw beside him so many nominees of the Peers. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baring) had said, that there was no want of talent in the other House. He would not say that there was, and he should have no objection if the hon. member for Thetford himself should be taken up there to increase the store of talent which that House already possessed. His purpose in rising before when he interrupted the hon. Gentleman, was to enlighten the ignorance of the hon. Gentleman, which was greater than that of a boy just come from school. Surely the public newspapers must have sufficiently informed the hon. Gentleman as to the cause of the Ministers' retirement if he was shut out from all other sources of information. However, the noble Lord opposite had now enlightened him; and he (Mr. Hume) must say that he was delighted with the speech of the noble Lord. He was glad that noble Lord had justified himself on such excellent grounds. As to the Address, he (Mr. Hume) was astonished, after the decisions to which the House had already come upon the subject of the Reform Bill, that any Gentleman could find fault with the Motion of the noble Lord. He only regretted that it did not go far enough. The House not only had the right to advise the Crown, and if the Crown did not attend to their advice in a matter which they believed to be of importance to the interest and the liberty of the people—they had not only the right to advise, but the power to give efficiency to their advice; and, he trusted, that that power would be exerted whenever their duty to the people required it. The people were not for the King, but the King was for the people, and it was his duty to use his power for their good only; and, when he used his power otherwise, or refused to do that which the interest of the people seemed to that House to demand, then it was the duty of the House to exert that power which the Constitution gave them to induce the King to pay attention to their advice. He (Mr. Hume) did not wish, in anything which he might say respecting the duty of the King to his people, and of what the people owed to the Sovereign, to speak disrespectfully of his Majesty. He merely said, that if the King did not exercise his prerogative for the good of the people, then it was the duty of the House to lay their advice humbly and respectfully at the foot of the Throne. But he would repel indignantly the assertion of the hon. member for Thetford, that the more humble was the language of an Address from that House to the Crown, the greater in direct proportion was the arrogance of the matter. The construction which that hon. Gentleman had put upon the present Address was most unfair, for he attempted to give it a meaning which the noble Mover never intended to convey. The character of the noble Lord was enough to refute the assertion that anything arrogant could come from him. It was evident that the noble Lord, in proposing the form of the Address, made the language studiously humble and meek, and avoided every expression which could bear the meaning imputed. It was, at first, owing to the delicacy of the noble Lord, much more moderate and humble than at present; and much more so than the circumstances of the case required. It had now become the duty of the House of Commons to go to the Throne, and to say that, having for eighteen months given their attention to the provisions of the Reform Bill, and being of opinion that it was necessary for the protection of the best interests of the people—aye, and of the Throne—the Commons respectfully advised his Majesty to reconsider his determination as to the late Ministers, and to take them back into his councils; for it would not be difficult to prove that there were no other men in that House, or in the House of Lords, who had not by their own conduct proved themselves to be incapable of carrying the Bill. It was in the recollection of every man in that House, that when, in consequence of being left in a minority of twenty-nine on the 15th of November, 1830, the right hon. Baronet below him (Sir Robert Peel) and his colleagues retired from office, and were succeeded by the Gentlemen opposite, nothing could exceed the delight of the country to see in power the men who had devoted their whole lives to the interest of the people, and who had ever been the advocates of Parliamentary Reform. Those Gentlemen did not take office greedily—the conduct of their whole lives proved that greediness of office could not be charged upon them.

Mr. *Baring* denied that he had used the word greedy, or imputed sordid motives to the Ministers. He could not sit quietly, and bear language attributed to him which he would be ashamed to use.

Mr. *Hume* did not impute to the hon. Gentleman the words which he disclaimed. But, he would ask, did Earl Grey enter upon office without a condition? Did he not, in fact, take office upon the express condition that the King would enable him to carry through a Reform of the House of Commons, such as he should deem to be efficient? Was there no agreement then? He would tell hon. Gentlemen, that whenever the explanation came which they so loudly called for, it must be shown that there was from the first an understanding between the Ministers and the King. All that the House had heard from them showed that they did not enter into office without a pledge to carry a Reform Bill, such as they should think to be the best for the interests of the country. Earl Grey had been all his life the advocate of Reform, and in 1793 he pledged himself to such a Reform as he had now endeavoured to carry into effect. It was not to be supposed then, that after a lapse of forty years, he came into office pledged to the same measure of Reform, if he had not the support of the King to the utmost extent; and whatever might have occurred since, he was sure that the Ministers could not have been in the wrong. But it had been objected to the creation of Peers, that there existed no necessity for having recourse to any such extreme proceeding. Did any rational man suppose that Lord Grey was so little acquainted with human nature as that, after the vote to which the Lords came on the second reading of the Bill he could, for one moment, suppose it possible to carry the Bill without a creation of Peers? Could he have been ignorant, even at the moment when he carried the second reading by a small majority, that he could eventually advance the Bill so as that it should become the law of the land? No—it was impossible for any man in his senses to imagine that such an object could be accomplished otherwise than by the means he had mentioned. Could any man who once gave his support to the Bill suppose that there was any other way of carrying it? Or could he lay claim to the slightest shadow of consistency if having once given it his support, he should suddenly turn round and deny the means requisite for carrying it to a successful conclusion? If he anticipated correctly the fit answers to these interrogatories, then he would say, with the greatest confidence in the soundness of the opinion, that it peculiarly behoved the House of Commons to take a decided measure at the present important crisis. He could but recollect, and he was sure the fact must be full too in the recollection of all who heard him, that there never was a plan of Parliamentary Reform propounded in this country which united so many persons in its support, as did the plan brought forward under the auspices of Lord Grey. It could not be forgotten, either, that when that plan was brought forward in that House on the 1st of March, 1831, it found but little favour in that House; and that when carried to a second reading, it was by such a small majority that it became as obvious then that the House of Commons would never agree to it, as it was now plain that the present House of Lords would never give it their consent. What was the consistent and noble course of conduct which his Majesty thought it fitting to pursue? He came down to Parliament, and by instantly dissolving them, gave that sanction to the Bill and to the counsels of his Ministers which until within a day or two he had never once withdrawn. Well, then, the measure came to Parliament recommended by the sanction of the King, in a manner that obtained for him the universal gratitude of his people. Never did Monarch receive such a meed of affectionate applause. Let the House only look to the language used by the King on the memorable 22nd of April, 1831; the words were these: "I have been induced to resort to this measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people, in the only way in which it can be most constitutionally and authentically expressed, on the expediency of making such changes in the Representation as circumstances may appear to require, and which, founded upon the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, may tend at once to uphold the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, and to give security to the liberties of the people."* In consequence of that dissolution a general election took place; and how did the people respond to that call? Did not the country, from one end to the other, declare in favour of the Bill? Did not many who had been habitually opposed to the late Government waive many of the objections which they might have had to any measure proceeding from them? The timid were induced to extend the amount of Reform—the more earnest Reformers limited their wishes—and never did there arise an instance in which a Government made so near an approximation to pleasing every body. He knew it would be impossible to please every body; but this he did know, that the plan which had just been rejected went further to satisfy the greatest number of Reformers than any former plan that ever had been laid before Parliament. At the opening of the present Session his Majesty used this language:—"I feel it my duty, in the first place, to recommend to your most careful consideration the measures which will be proposed to you for a Reform in the Commons House of Parliament. A speedy and satisfactory settlement of this question becomes daily of more pressing importance to the security of the State, and to the contentment and welfare of my people."† Those were the sentiments of the King; at least they were sentiments to which he gave his most solemn sanction, and in so many words did he deliver them with his own lips to the assembled Parliament of this great country, and now they found that the Monarch rejected such advice as was necessary for carrying the Bill into a law—nay, even if such explicit declarations had not at any time been personally made, the mere fact that the Monarch retained the authors of the Bill in his service was enough to justify all mankind in taking it for granted, that the Bill had his entire sanction and support, and so also should they assume that he had given his consent, and pledged himself to all means requisite for carrying forward that measure to its full completion. He asked the House to tell him what were men, so placed, to do? They owed it to their Sovereign not to remain in office a single day after they found themselves unable to carry the Bill upon which they had staked their existence as public men. They began with the Bill under the circumstances which he had stated—they went forward with it, confronting one of the most formidable Oppositions that ever was organized to defeat a single measure. Not a moment's delay took place, that they could, by possibility, have avoided—it was at length sent to the Upper House, and its fate there was but too well known; but what followed upon it? A protest was entered upon the Journals, and signed by seventy-six of the most influential Members of the Upper House, declaring that it was a measure of the most revolutionary character, and tending to destroy the balance of the Constitution. He would inquire how they were to judge of men's conduct otherwise than he had proposed they should judge, namely, not by the language, but by the actions, of those noble persons. Surely, men of the world would judge of them, not only by what they said but by what they did. He could not help being actually amused by the artlessness with which the hon. Member below him spoke of the confidence that might be placed in the declarations of those noble Lords, when they assured the world that they would give not only as good a Reform as the Ministers who had just left office, but that they would go a little further, and throw Weymouth into the bargain. The hon. Member who had thus so artlessly told them to place unlimited confidence in the declarations of those noble Lords had spoken most contemptuously of some of the public meetings which had been held in various parts of the country as well as in the metropolis. He would inform the hon. Member—he need not inform many other Members in that House, for most of them knew it perfectly well—that those meetings were any thing but deserving of the contempt which the hon. Member had thought proper to lavish upon them. He would recommend the hon. Member to attend one of those meetings; and if he could form anything like a judgment of himself, he must return with the full conviction that the humblest speaker in the habit of attending there was fully equal to the task of exposing the fallacy of his reasonings—speeches of that stamp would not be endured at a Political Union—not even a *millionnaire* could render such logic as that acceptable, if addressed to any auditory, unless it were the Holy Alliance; but it was reasoning that would never do for any political club, nor for any Reform Association, from one end of the kingdom to the other. Reference had been made to all that the Anti-Reformers had promised to do; but then let it be remembered how late they were in coming forward with that promise of theirs. Over and over again they were asked to state what extent of reform they were ready to concede, but they sedulously concealed their intentions, and took care to say nothing. But setting aside all considerations connected with them personally, and with their conduct as individuals, and as a party, he would come to this point—on what foundation did the Bill rest? The first principle of the Bill was schedule A. It was an inversion of everything like common sense and reason, to give any other part of the Bill precedence of that schedule: and it was unparalleled to address any advocacy of such a mode of proceeding to an assembly of grown up persons. There were no intelligent children who would allow their minds to be influenced by such a mode of treating an important subject. It was idle to think that the conduct of the late advisers of the Crown could be assailed upon such a ground as that, forsooth, they had put the wrong part of the Bill first. He had himself heard the noble Lord who had propounded the plan of the Anti-Reformers, for so he would persist in calling them——he had heard that noble Lord say, that the Bill was revolutionary. Was it men such as that who were in future to fill the councils of the King? Was it men who told the country that though disapproving of the Bill as a whole, they were yet willing to go with it into Committee, in the hope of there improving its details? If any man thought he could lead people into the belief that the Bill could come out of such hands otherwise than ruined, they would find few but old women for their disciples. He doubted if there was any sane man in the United Kingdom who thought that the party whom he had been alluding to entertained an honest wish to go into the Committee with the desire of improving the Bill, and rendering it better, upon the same principles and basis upon which it had been originally proposed; and yet he supposed it was to men of that stamp that the country was to look for a new Administration. What were they to think of an Administration, in the present posture of public affairs, who would not give one rotten borough for the sake of obtaining Reform? And be it remembered, that a Judge of the land formed a portion of that remarkable party. Let them only look to the conduct and public principles of that noble Lord. Did the hon. Member for Thetford forget all the various changes which the opinions of that noble Lord had undergone? Was there any old woman in the country who would put faith in declarations coming from one who had changed so often? It was almost in vain to combat any further the reasonings of the hon. Member below him, who had all at once taken it into his head to contrast the Aristocracy with the people, so much to the disadvantage of the latter. He would undertake to draw by lot fifteen weavers, shoemakers, or other artizans, and he would undertake to say, that there would be not one of them who would not prove that the whole speech of the hon. Member was, upon his own showing, fallacious. But he would no longer occupy the time of the House with any subject so unimportant. The moment had at length arrived, when a House faithful to their trust could no longer refrain from approaching the Monarch, and humbly representing to him that they could not place confidence in any Administration except that of those men who had, under his own gracious sanction and support, introduced the important measure for amending the Representation of England and Wales. That measure now had been before the country for eighteen tedious months, and no man who mixed with the people out of doors could for a moment doubt that a degree of intense anxiety existed upon the subject, far surpassing anything which the annals of past occasions of political excitement could supply. All public business was at a stand—at least there was no public business done in that House; all men had been waiting with the anxious hope of seeing the great measure brought to a happy conclusion, and were they now to see nothing but the disappointment of all their anxious hopes and wishes? Some allusions had been made to the present advisers of the King—he did not allude to responsible advisers, but to an influence behind the Throne: if there were advisers behind the Throne, let them be unmasked. If it were in his power to unmask them, he would do so most willingly. He should bear the present state of affairs in mind, and if it ever should be in his power to make known that influence, nothing should deter him from the disclosure. While on that subject he could not refrain from noticing, that an attempt had been made to fix upon the Reformers a disposition to impute to an illustrious personage, standing in the closest relation to his Majesty, something like improper interference on that subject. Now, once for all, he wished to put down anything of that sort; there had not been a syllable uttered, and he was sure there would not be any Members of that House ready to impute to her anything of the sort, or state anything whatever to her disadvantage; and he must say, that he thought it very unfair to endeavour to cast a slur upon the Reformers by insinuating that they had made any accusation of the sort; they had never gone further than to affirm, that his Majesty had been very ill advised, and he hoped that would be the last time that he or any Member of that House should have occasion to advert to the subject; and now, in concluding his notice of it, he would say, that if any individuals, of either sex, presumed to give irresponsible advice to the King, let them take the consequences. The public had ears to hear, and eyes to see, and judgments to guide their conduct, and let those who meddled with affairs of State take fair warning, and be prepared for the consequences—the natural and unavoidable consequences of their own conduct. But to put an end to observations of that kind, he should once more repeat, what he had so often said before, that no Government could expect to carry any measure of that difficult and important character, without removing from the higher offices all persons supposed to be hostile to the measure. He would speak out. There was Lord Hill. He was known to have voted against the measure. It was now too late, however, to dwell at much length upon topics of that nature; the time for them had passed away. The business with which the House was that night occupied, was the conduct of the noble Lords and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the act of the late Ministers of the Crown in reference to the Reform Bill; and of that conduct he hoped there was no man whose opinion was of the slightest value who would, for a moment, say that the conduct of those persons should be judged by isolated circumstances—it ought to be taken as a whole, and judged of in the aggregate, and viewing it in its collective character, he would, without fear of successful contradiction, boldly affirm, that they would be unworthy of the confidence of that House if they had not taken the only step which it was in their power to take—that of respectfully tendering their resignations to the King; and now he would ask, who was to succeed them? Was it the right hon. Baronet below him (Sir Robert Peel)? Was it the Duke of Wellington?—he who declared against all Reform. Could they expect anything good from them? And surely that House would not give its support to any Administration upon which it could not place the fullest reliance for the passing of the Bill. He demanded to have Schedule A to a large extent—to its fullest extent—and Schedule B, and the other Schedules, in all their important parts; and with respect to the other parts and regulations of the Bill, he required that they should not be so changed as to prevent the effectual operation of the rest of the measure; and with nothing less than that should he rest satisfied; nor should anything induce him to support a Ministry that would accept office without stipulating for the means of carrying such a measure into beneficial effect. They had been told, however, that some of the candidates for office proposed to give them the scot and lot right of voting in some places. He, of course, did not object to the scot and lot qualification—he cared not how widely the qualification might be extended, though he should not contend for it in any manner that might tend to create a division amongst the sincere friends of that which he willingly called an efficient Reform, as far as it went. That measure of Reform which had been introduced by the noble Lord opposite, was one which upon these grounds, had had his most cordial support; and which during its existence was marked by this extraordinary quality, that it obtained the unanimous approbation of the whole country. There was not a public meeting held in any part of the United Kingdom which did not express a general approbation of its provisions. It did not, however, please the owners of boroughs; and the hon. Member below him told the House, in his usual manner, that the boroughholders, as such, had no feeling hostile to Reform. He believed there was no intelligent man, who paid the slightest attention to public affairs, could believe it possible for any hon. Member gravely to get up in that House and make such an assertion; let them only recollect how the borough Members usually voted in that House; let them only remember the result of those votes; and then let them say, whether or not those results were brought about by mere accidental coincidence or by design? The history of that House would show—he would not say whether by design or accident—that the votes of the borough Members all tended one way; it had become matter of the most perfect notoriety, that almost all the Peerages procured for many a year were procured through the agency of the rotten boroughs; those were the high-minded chivalrous Peers who threw out the Reform Bill—those were the dirty means by which the House of Peers had been recruited—he called them dirty means, the expression was perfectly classical, and had been used by Mr. Burke, and was often repeated in that House. It was, then, through those dirty means—it was through that mass of filth and ordure—that Commoners ascended to the House of Peers; it was time, therefore, that that filthy and disgraceful traffic should be brought to an end, that there should be an end of the language, the derogatory language, in which those Peers, so elevated, were accustomed to speak of the people of England. Amongst the various arguments which had been urged in favour of the rejection of the Bill, it had been said that the Universities were opposed to it. Yes; the clergy were certainly opposed to the Reform; and, when they looked at the votes of the heads of the Church in the upper House, they could not doubt the sentiments of the great body of the clergy; but, as to the property of the country, it was ten to one in favour of the Bill. Though he had touched upon so many topics, and had so long occupied the attention of the House, he could not, before he concluded, refrain from noticing what had been said with respect to the petition which came from the Corporation of London, respecting which it had been said, that the petitioners had much better have occupied themselves with their own affairs. Now, he should be glad to learn whose affair the Reform Bill was, unless it was the affair of the people of England? And he presumed it would be admitted, that the inhabitants of the metropolis were entitled to take a lead in any proceeding so deeply affecting the interests of the people of England. They had, he would contend, the fullest possible right to call the attention of the House to the fact, that the Commons possessed the control of the public purse, and that, if the people were left without due Representation, that the funds of the public ought to be intrusted to parliamentary Commissioners appointed by the constitutional guardians of the public money. The petitioners came to that House backed by every sound argument, and by every principle of justice, and as one of the Representatives of the people, he should stand up in his place and support such a proposition. Some hon. Members might smile, but this he would tell them, that they were standing on the brink of a volcano, and that the sooner they made themselves acquainted with their real situation the better. There was amongst the Members, in the midst of whom he then stood, some degree of education; they had sufficient intelligence to take care of themselves, and he warned them to be cautious before it was too late. Of this they might fully satisfy themselves, that, should the proper time arrive, the House of Commons would not be backward to do its duty, even constituted as it now was. The best men, in every age, had sanctioned, by the declaration of their opinions, the doctrine for which the petitioners contended. It had ever been held, that the constitutional doctrine was, that the Crown should enjoy its prerogative, the Lords their privileges, but neither could deprive the Commons of their control over the public purse; or the people of their just right to full and fair Representation; and, indisputably, the Representatives they at present possessed had the undoubted right of using their control over the public purse to secure an improved mode of Representation, or to effect any other legitimate object; they had a clear right to a redress of grievances before they gave away the money of the public. He was fully prepared to go that length, and he was sure that the people would back him. For his part, he had never voted a single shilling to a Minister. According to the Constitution, the money was always voted to the King. In the present excited state of the public mind, it behoved them to be cautious what they did, and make provision to avert the danger before it overwhelmed them. He held it utterly impossible for any half dozen men to sit down, and, by any calculation, to arrive at the real opinion of the one hundred and fifty Lords who voted on Monday in the House of Peers. Having now sufficiently wearied the House, he would come to his last point—that Ministers were right in the view they had taken of the subject, and in the course they had adopted. He gave the opponents of Ministers great credit for having kept their counsel to the last; but it was certain, that the proposition which had been vainly resisted went to the root of the Bill. The great sore and ulcer of the present system was, the existence of rotten boroughs; and the object of Ministers had been to remove them. What was the rule they had established for this purpose? That all boroughs which had not a population of 2,000 persons, should be placed in schedule A; and that all boroughs which had not a population of 4,000 persons, should be placed in schedule B. If, therefore, these had been abolished, and not a single borough enfranchised, an important change, and a great good, would have been effected. The Amendment in the other House, therefore, went to the foundation and vital principle of the Bill. All the Lords were at variance upon every point; and upon none more than the position, that the Amendment was a mere matter of form. The degree of enfranchisement in the Bill had nothing to do with the degree of disfranchisement; and it was a wonder that, in the course of the debate, nobody attempted to set noble Lords right upon the point; for the debate concluded, as it had begun, in complete ignorance of the true principles of the Bill. It was, as it ought to have been, a *sine qua non* with Ministers to carry their measure of Reform, and they were right to tell the King, that, if he would not trust them with the power of creating thirty, fifty, or even 100 Peers, they were unworthy the royal confidence. All they wanted was the authority of the Crown: it was understood that the proposal was, that sixty Peers should be made, and that less would not have done: for his part, he should have had no objection to the creation of 100 Peers. This he would say, knowing what he did of the other House of Parliament, that he would stake his existence, that if the King had given Earl Grey a *carte blanche* to make as many Peers as were wanted, not ten would have been requisite. From the course taken by the majority on the late occasion, it was evident that some little bird had whispered them, that the King would not consent to the creation of any Peers. Somehow or other they had obtained a knowledge of that fact; and, under the circumstances, Ministers had no choice—they were perfectly right in what they had done, and they stood justified to the country. Instead of delaying all public business—instead of keeping the public mind in a ferment, they did wisely to bring the whole question at once to issue. The true mode of avoiding the necessity for making many Peers was, to obtain an unlimited power of doing so; if only twenty, forty, or sixty were granted, the evil might return—the snake might be "scotched" and not "killed," whereas, if the Minister had been trusted with full authority, the Peers would have known their interests, if not their duty, and would have passed the Bill with only a small addition to their numbers. He hoped that the House, by its vote to-night, and the country, by its conduct hereafter, would uphold Ministers in the course they had taken, and would support the Reform Bill to its triumphant termination.

---

* See Hansard, vol. iii. pp. 1810-11.

† Ibid. vol. ix, p. 1, 2.

Mr. *Baring* explained. The hon. member for Middlesex had hardly touched a point to which he (Mr. Baring) had adverted, without misrepresentation. He had never said, for instance, that the City of London had no business to petition, but merely that the petition was unwise. He had never imputed that Members in this House were the instruments of clamour out of doors. Thirdly, the hon. member for Middlesex had represented him as asserting, that the Motion of the noble Lord was full of arrogance. Nothing could be further from it; and all he (Mr. Baring) had stated was, that, in times of turbulence, phrases of humility were usually in proportion to the actual arrogance of every proposition.

Mr. *Hume* assured the hon. Gentleman, that he had not intended to misrepresent what he had said, but he had taken down from his mouth the assertion that clubs and brawlers without had their delegates within. He had also understood the hon. Gentleman to assert, that the petition of the City of London was a very foolish one, and, as a citizen himself, he must say, that no greater insult could be offered.

Lord *Morpeth*, in offering himself for a very short time to the notice of the House at this peculiar and momentous conjuncture, knew not whether he might not labour under some degree of disqualification, from the circumstance, that a near connection, though not in the actual service, was in the confidence of his Sovereign, as a member of the Administration. Whatever deduction this fact might make from any value possessed by his opinion, he must, of course, be content to bear it; but he could not, at the same time, forget, that he had been sent to the House of Commons by perhaps the largest constituency of the empire, and that he had not chosen to add any other post, however highly offered, to that of being their Representative. He had a claim, therefore, individually, to speak on their behalf, and on his own, what seemed best fitted to this painful and solemn crisis. His noble friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had plainly stated, what no man doubted, that the advice of the Ministers to his Majesty was a large, that is to say, an adequate creation of Peers. He (Lord Morpeth) was as willing as any man to admit that, in some points of view, this step might appear a violent and startling measure—that it would establish a precedent, which, if followed without an apparent and undeniable necessity, would expose the individual giving such advice to the highest responsibility. But if the alternative were, as he contended in this instance it was, that the measure thereby to be carried would restore and perpetuate a good understanding between different orders and classes in the realm, or (to use the very words of the hon. member for Thetford), "to secure the prosperity and happiness of the country," any person who talked of the degradation of the Peerage for such a beneficent and healing purpose, was without the essential attributes of a manly understanding and enlarged patriotism. Were the memorials of ancestral dignity, or the escutcheons of ancient chivalry, to be accounted sullied and degraded because the order to which they belonged had taken deeper root in a more congenial soil—the affections of a grateful people? He entirely and heartily concurred in the Address moved by his noble friend, and he earnestly hoped that it would be effectively and zealously supported; he regretted, indeed, the necessity for such a proceeding—he regretted the intelligence which had suddenly and unhappily burst upon the country yesterday—he regretted it from attachment to his Sovereign—who, he must always believe, had the interests of his people at heart—he regretted it for the sake of the interests of the Crown, and of the probable comfort and peace of the present reign—he regretted it on account of the Government, which must speedily be at an end, unless the House of Commons supplied the means of averting such a calamity. In his opinion, Ministers deserved better things; he was not such a clumsy panegyrist as to assert that they were uniformly free from error; occasionally inexperience and want of official habits had led them into mistakes; but, looking at essentials (without including in the view the great and just measure of Reform), it would be seen, that, under circumstances of much difficulty and embarrassment, they had secured to their country and to Europe the invaluable blessing of peace. Whatever was the result, Ministers would retire with character untouched—consistency untainted—and honour unblemished. As, when they entered office, they bore with them the hopes, so on withdrawing from office they would be followed by the plaudits of the nation—*populum reditus morantem.* He the more lamented the present gloomy prospect for Reform, because recent events were eminently calculated to give a fatal and ill-advised triumph—not to the Tories—not to the Conservatives—their day was past, and little more would be heard either of their principles or their speeches—but to the extreme Radicals [*cheers from Mr. Hunt*], who either founded their hopes on mischief (and probably the utterer of the last cheer did not wish to be included in that number), or who pushed their views much further than our better reason and the actual condition of society would allow—theirs would be the triumph, unless the House interposed to prevent it, and unless the real friends of conservative Reform—the true friends of the Constitution stepped forward to vindicate the measure, and to ensure its success. He remembered, no longer ago than the election before the last, when he had the honour of canvassing the county of York, in company with the present Lord Chancellor, long before any tidings had arrived of the French or of the Belgian revolutions, that he had heard enough, in the language and opinions of those whom he addressed, to satisfy him that it would be an almost unheard of blessing if the friends of Reform of all sorts, by some lucky fatality, could be brought to concur in one general and comprehensive scheme, which would be a remedy for prevailing abuses, a satisfaction of existing claims, and a barrier against future encroachments. That scheme was the Reform Bill—that remedy, that satisfaction, and that barrier, Parliament had had in its hands. This happy conclusion —this concentration of the wishes and opinions of all Reformers, had grown and prospered until yesterday—it was at once dashed down and destroyed. He did not dread the ultimate success of the cause of Reform—what he feared was, its immediate or rather intermediate prospects. Were the friends of the measure to look for straightforward dealing from those whom his noble friend had happily described, when he said that they made speeches against disfranchisement, and yet in the same breath asserted, that they were ready, by destroying 113 seats in the House of Commons, to make even schedule A hide its diminished head? In the event, too, of a change in the Councils of the King, to whom was Parliament to look as a leader? His singular aptitude in debate, and his other eminent talents, seemed to point out the right hon. Baronet, the member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel), as the fittest person; but would he charge himself with the responsibility either of this or of any other measure of adequate relief? The disappointment would be deeply and severely felt in all parts of the country; but he (Lord Morpeth) trusted that the people, both from a principle of duty (from which no man could be justified in swerving), and from a principle of policy (which no man should be unwise enough to neglect) would receive the tidings with calmness, and bear their disappointment with temper. He hoped that they would, on all accounts, preserve tranquillity and obedience to the laws, while they adhered firmly and steadily to those men who alone could tread the path of safety, and bring this great experiment of Reform to a happy issue. As far as related to the House of Commons, if there were any thing like gratitude, consistency, or honour left, it was bound now, as on former occasions, to support those who, through doubt, difficulty, and obloquy, had advocated the principles of Reform, that hereafter it might never be said of the Representatives of the people, that through their fault the Bill had been lost, on the passing of which the nation had set their hearts.

Mr. *Robinson* wished briefly to state the grounds on which he should vote for the Motion of the noble Lord. He looked upon that Motion to be substantially a re-assertion, by a solemn Address to the Crown, of the opinion entertained by that House on the Reform question. It would show at least, that a British House of Commons did not shrink from the vote it had already given, and that it was anxious to convey to the Crown and the country, that no measure of Reform, essentially different from that which had passed by so large a majority, could be acceptable to that House. He had heard an opinion expressed out of doors, as well as within the walls of that House, to the effect that the Motion of the noble Lord was premature; but he begged to express his dissent from that opinion. Neither could he concur with those who censured the Government for resigning. Ministers themselves were the best judges whether they ought to persevere after what had occurred in the House of Lords. Be this as it might, it was most important that the country and the Crown should have no doubt of the opinion of the House of Commons, whilst his Majesty was engaged in forming a new Administration. Such was, in his opinion, the proper time, beyond all others, for that House to state to the King, firmly, but respectfully, in the mode which the Constitution pointed out, that no Government was likely to receive the support of that House which should not be prepared to introduce and carry through Parliament a measure of Reform fully commensurate with that which had already passed through the House. If such a declaration was made by that House, he held it to be impossible that any Administration could resist it. How could the Government of the country in that House be carried on by any Administration which was adverse to Reform? Was it by another appeal to the people? Could any one be weak enough to suppose that, after the opinion of the people had been so plainly and decisively manifested on the question of Reform, the effect of another appeal must not be, to send the same or other Representatives to that House equally favourable to the Reform question? In conclusion, he wished to put it to those Gentlemen who thought the measure of Reform introduced by Ministers too extensive, what the situation of the country would be if they passed two or three years more discussing this subject? He begged to remind them what had been the state of the nation for two years during which this subject had been under discussion. As had been well observed, the whole business of the country had been in a state of abeyance. Commerce was languishing—everything was at a stand—and, for his own part, he could not look without the greatest apprehension and dismay at the continued discussion of this question. It had been said, that it would be better if Reform was effected by degrees; but that he must deny altogether. He believed, if the House of Lords had passed the Bill sent up by that House, it would have set the question at rest for many years. He did not believe any House of Commons could be got now which would be satisfied with a less extensive measure; but, if such a House could be got, what would it lead to? To the agitation of the question again; and, eventually, the measure of Reform now before Parliament, or something very like it, must be carried. The only question, therefore, as it seemed to him, was, whether they were to have Reform now, or after a few years' longer discussion, during which the country would be kept in agitation, suffering, and uncertainty? He should only add, that the noble Lord's Motion had his cordial support, and he could not see how any one who voted for the Reform Bill could vote against that Motion.

Lord *Sandon* would detain the House but a few minutes to express the view he entertained of the Address which had been proposed by his noble friend. He was not only prepared, but anxious, to join him at this important crisis, in expressing the firm adherence of that House to the great principles and essential provisions of the measure of Reform which had been sent up to the other House of Parliament. It was a duty imperatively forced upon them by circumstances which might induce the people of this country to think, that the measure to which they were so much attached, was now in danger, as well as by the importance of impressing upon his Majesty, and upon those who might be called upon to form a new Administration, whoever they might be, that they must be prepared to carry the main principles of that Bill into efficient operation. He was also prepared, and desirous to express with his noble friend, his deep regret at the change in his Majesty's Councils, by which the completion of the Reform Bill would fall into other hands than those which originated that measure; into the hands of men who could not take charge of it without some sacrifice of that consistency, which was so valuable an ingredient in any public character, but which the necessities of the time called loudly upon them on this occasion to give up to the still higher considerations of public safety. He regretted deeply, for this reason, that this change in his Majesty's Councils should have taken place; but he must avow, that he thought the circumstances which had led to this change were rather of a personal, than a political nature, and that the step which his Majesty's Ministers had taken was not called for by the occasion. The vote come to in the other House was not in itself of essential importance to the Bill. A similar proposition had been looked upon as unimportant by the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by the noble Paymaster of the Forces; and if it did throw some suspicion upon the ulterior objects of those who made the proposition—though those suspicions might have been much allayed by the declarations of many who supported it—yet it would surely have been wiser to allow two or three days' discussion to bring these suspicions to the test, than to act at once upon them, and proceed to the extreme measure to which his Majesty's Ministers had had recourse. He believed that these discussions would have removed this unfounded suspicion, and that, at the end of another week, schedule A would have been brought back to its original place in the Bill, not materially altered from that shape in which it had been sent up, but, as appeared by the declarations of some noble Lords, rather enlarged and extended in its operation. That it was a very embarrassing situation for a Minister of the Crown not to have the command of a majority in the passing of any important measure which he proposed, he was fully prepared to admit, and he had always foreseen that great difficulties would arise from that circumstance in the passage of this Bill through a Committee of the other House; but he had also thought that, provided the main principles of the Reform Bill were carried into effect in that Committee, the patriotism of the noble Lord would have induced him to submit to some of those embarrassments, and what he might think humiliations, when so fearful a step, as advising his Majesty to annihilate the independence of the House of Lords, or of throwing the country into its present awful situation, was the only alternative. At any rate, he had thought that the noble Earl, by consenting to go into the Committee with that branch of the Legislature in its present state, especially after the language which he had employed on the second reading of the Bill, had given, at least, a virtual pledge, that such was his intention. Under these circumstances, therefore, whatever might be his opinion upon the policy of pressing that Motion to a division, he felt himself warranted in asserting, that it was rather a feeling of personal annoyance on the part of his Majesty's Ministers, than of real doubt as to the ultimate success of all the main provisions of the Bill, that had led them to pursue the course which they had taken. However that might be, he entertained a sincere regret at their retirement from his Majesty's Councils, and could have no hesitation in expressing it. The measure itself, however, he did not consider in any real danger. The House of Lords had affirmed its principle, and a great number of its most influential Members had expressed their assent to its more essential details. As he had said before, he regretted that the conducting it should have passed out of the hands of its proposers; but the main point, after all, for the advantage of the country was, that it should be carried, no matter by whom, and that as quickly as possible, into effect. He was convinced that not only the interests, but the wishes of their constituents, would be best considered by keeping this object constantly in view. It was a settlement of this question, which was desired by all parties in the country; until that object was attained, all public confidence was suspended, and the operations of commerce and industry paralysed. Let everybody, then, lend his hands, and apply his shoulders to the forwarding of this main point; and he trusted a very few days would see such progress made in the essential parts of the Bill before the other House, as might set the public anxiety at rest. There was one part of the Address proposed by his noble friend, on which, before he assented to the whole, he must make some remarks. It was that which spoke of unabated confidence in his Majesty's Ministers. Now, confidence he had been obliged to refuse to his Majesty's Ministers on several points of their policy, and, therefore, he could hardly, in strictness, talk of reposing unabated confidence in them. Even in the conduct of their measure of Reform, there were several points to which he had thought it his duty to follow the dictates of his own judgment, and to differ from the course which they had recommended. If, again, these expressions should be intended to convey approbation of the advice given by them to the Crown, for the annihilation of the independence of the other House, he should feel it impossible for him to unite in the expression of such an opinion; but he had not heard it so interpreted by those who drew up the Resolution. He considered it as expressing regret that the Reform Bill should have passed into other hands, and re-affirming their attachment to its essential provisions, as the most desirable at the present crisis—an object too important to allow him to look nicely at the expressions in which it was conveyed. With this explanation he should feel it his duty to support the Resolutions of his noble friend.

Sir *Robert Peel* spoke to the following effect:—Sir, the noble Lord has imposed a duty on me of stating to the House why I dissent from the Resolutions. After the discussion in which the House has been engaged for the last eighteen months, it would be absurd in me not to suppose that my opinion respecting these Resolutions differs from the opinion of the majority of this House; but I see nothing, Sir, in the circumstances of the times which should make me shrink, in the slightest degree, from expressing that opinion, because I am convinced that it differs from the opinion of the majority. I differ from the Resolutions because I do not place confidence in his Majesty's late Ministers. I differ from them because I do not agree to the expediency of the measure which has been under discussion; and I differ from them, because I consider that they establish a precedent dangerous at all times, but peculiarly dangerous in the circumstances in which we at present stand. I differ most from the Resolutions, because they advocate an extensive change in the Constitution of this House; to which I—though it has been sanctioned by the majority of this House —have always refused to be a party. I retain my opinion, that the change is a perilous experiment — the most perilous that ever was tried; and retaining my opinion unaltered, nothing which I have heard this night—nothing in the language of the hon. Gentleman (the member for Middlesex), who has expressed his readiness to withhold the Supplies, and vest the money in Commissioners—nothing, I say, which I have heard in the language of the hon. Gentleman, has at all tended to diminish the apprehensions which I entertain of the measure of Reform. I shall presume to say, if we are about to make an extensive change in the Consitution—if we are about to make this House the express image—not of the deliberate and well-weighed sentiments of the people, but of popular impatience—that I dread the consequences, and I must look with active and scrutinizing regard at any precedents likely to confirm that disposition to encroachment which I so much dread. The consequence of the change will be, to make this House the express image and reflection of the popular voice, I believe, and this we have always urged. But if we make this House answer to the expectations of the people, I do not see how that can be reconciled, particularly as some hon. Members have described this House as immediately backed by the popular voice, and as supported by the physical strength of the people at least—I cannot reconcile to myself how such a House of Commons can exist with our mixed form of Government. If there could be any thing dangerous in the Resolutions at any time, that danger must, in my view, be particularly apprehended if we adopt such a precedent on the eve of another extensive change. The House cannot be surprised that I differ from the Resolutions, and cannot be surprised that I think the moment for submitting them to the House not well chosen. That was the opinion, too, of the noble Lord opposite—the opinion of an individual than whom no man's opinion is more worthy of confidence, who for eighteen months has been intrusted with the management of public business in this House; and that noble Lord's first impression was, that, at the present moment, when there was no Government existing—when there was an important crisis at hand—feeling that it would interfere with the prerogatives of the Crown for the House to declare the opinion which was implied in the Resolutions, the noble Lord had thought, in the first instance, that at this moment such an expression of opinion was to be avoided. The noble Lord's more mature opinion, after reflection and deliberation, confirmed his first impression. Though I have not often voted with the noble Lord, on his opinion I place some reliance; and he has repeated to-day the opinion he gave last night, that the moment for these Resolutions was peculiarly inappropriate; and in that opinion I cordially concur. If I wanted any authority against the terms of the Resolutions, I should refer to that of the noble Lord, the author of the Resolutions. We have been told by the hon. Gentleman, the member for Middlesex, something of the history of the Resolutions proposed by the noble Lord. The hon. Member, in rebutting an accusation that was never made, and that will never be deservedly made—an accusation that the noble Lord, who had moved the Resolution, had shown disrespect to the Crown—the hon. Member, acting, as he frequently does, from completely misunderstanding the matter, and from mistaking the observations to which he undertook to reply, entered into a most unnecessary vindication of the noble Lord, and in the course of that vindication had made some important disclosures—"I can prove," the hon. Member said, "that the noble Lord did not intend any disrespect, because he contemplated originally much milder Resolutions, something very short and very simple in themselves"—something which the hon. Gentleman described, with a construction peculiar to himself, as much too weak for him. The hon. Gentleman then had been permitted to suggest alterations which the noble Lord admitted, and which made the Resolutions not strong enough, indeed, for him, but more acceptable than the original Resolutions. The hon. Gentleman, then, is the author of part of the Resolutions, and I have the original Resolutions of the noble Lord, as a proof that the present Resolutions are not exactly what he approved of. If, then, I am to find out the object of the Resolutions from the speech of one of the authors of them, I must say, from the speech of the hon. Member, that they are intended to express decided approbation of the measures of his Majesty's Ministers in recommending an increase of the House of Peers. The Resolutions call upon the House to express unaltered confidence in the Ministers who have resigned, because such advice was not followed. But, before the hon. Member, who knows all about the matter, calls on me to agree to the Resolutions, he will, perhaps, condescend to give me as much information as he possesses. The hon. Member says, he approves of the Resolutions; perhaps he will tell us how much of them he drew up? The hon. Gentleman has a habit of taking down words, and I have followed the hon. Gentleman's excellent example. The hon. Gentleman said, "I think it necessary to express our unabated confidence, in consequence of the course the Ministers pursued. I blame them not for asking to make twenty or thirty Peers, or for demanding such an addition to the House of Peers as would secure the success of the Reform Bill; if the Ministers had demanded sixty or 100, if that were necessary, it would only make the measure more acceptable to me." The hon. Gentleman said—and it was impossible to misunderstand him—"that there are two parties, and it is impossible for one party to be wrong, and that party is the King's Government." The hon. Gentleman did not draw the conclusion; but it did not need his logical acumen to know, that, if one party cannot be wrong, the other must be. This is the inference which the hon. Gentleman did not draw, but which every body else will. The hon. Gentleman has talked of some intrigues, of some recent communications. If the hon. Gentleman has any information on this subject, let him bring it forward; let him state who it is that assumes a power unknown to the Constitution, which the Constitution has never granted, and interferes between the responsible advisers of the Crown and the Crown itself. I am not prepared, then, to assent to the first Resolution, which expresses unaltered confidence in the Government. I am bound, out of respect to myself, to say, that I cannot agree to that Resolution. With many of the measures of the Government I have found it impossible to agree, and when I have found it necessary to object to them, I have boldly stated my objections; but having objected to their measures, it cannot be expected that I should express confidence in the men. My opposition, however, has not been factious; and when I have been able to assent to their measures, I have given them a fair and honest support; but I must abstain from agreeing to a Resolution which calls on me to express unaltered confidence in respect to their past proceedings in giving advice to the Crown. It seems to me that the Resolutions are not applicable to the present circumstances, which do not call upon us to express unaltered confidence. In the present state of our information to express confidence, when no explanations have been received, is too much consistently to require. I have a right to know, before being asked for such a vote, to know under what precise circumstances the advice was given, and precisely what it was. The noble Lord (Althorp) says, that the advice they gave the Sovereign was, to make a sufficient number of Peers to enable the Government to carry a particular measure; but if upon such grounds I am asked to declare unabated confidence in the Ministers I must say nothing can be more unfortunate or more inconsistent, for I can conceive nothing more fatal to the dignity of the Crown, more foolish, more destructive of the Constitution, and the best interests of the country than for the Crown to act upon such advice. If that were to be done, what meaning could be given to the words "authority of both Houses of Parliament?" What an abuse of words it would be to talk of that authority, and why call upon us to go through the solemn mockery of declaring that measures had received the sanction and the authority of both Houses of Parliament? The hon. Gentleman says, and he calls upon the House of Commons to support a Resolution, that it is adviseable, by creating sixty or a hundred Peers, to overwhelm the independent voice of one branch of the Legislature; and as I cannot be a party to an Act which would convert all our subsequent proceedings into a mere mockery, as well as overthrow the Constitution, I cannot join in that Resolution. The noble Lord (Lord Morpeth) asked, what disgrace would it be to the escutcheons of the Peers to have an infusion of other Members into their body? Does not the noble Lord see the use which Government may at any time make of the same language? After a century shall have passed, perhaps, he thinks this precedent may again be acted on, and then that some Government may find some measure as important as this, and deserving to be carried by similar means. Let the noble Lord not deceive himself; he will not have to wait so long to see the precedent acted on. I know that this measure is described as one of unequalled importance; but two years will not elapse before some other measure, supposed to be of equal importance, will require that this precedent should be repeated and the Peers overwhelmed by a new creation, to carry some popular purpose. In the abstract, certainly, it must ever be most dangerous for the Crown to create an immense number of Peerages with a view to carry any particular measure, and nothing can excuse or justify it but some overpowering necessity. Conceding the principle, for the sake of argument, which, in fact, however, I never will concede, what proof have we of any necessity to justify such a creation at present? In making this precedent which would be so dangerous under any circumstances it is now doubly dangerous, because there is no actual necessity to justify it, but only a vague suspicion that at some future time a necessity may arise, and without waiting till it has arrived, and merely to enable the Government to meet such a contingency, the Ministers have given advice of so fearful and fatal a tendency. In making the concession that such an abstract principle may be acted on, I demand to know why you will not wait till the necessity arises? Half the debate on the present evening has been taken up by taunts against Gentlemen who have changed their opinion and admit the propriety of passing schedule A. On such a subject nothing is more unworthy or more unwise than such a proceeding; for though hon. Members differ from some noble Lords, why should they cast imputations on them when they were endeavouring as men of honour to make an honest compromise on an important question of this kind? Suppose it was found that the House of Lords, after the second reading of the Bill, considered, that by the second reading they were not strictly bound to agree to the whole measure as concocted by the Government; but, supposing that they had agreed to go into a Committee, and having done that, were willing to give their support to schedule A, to reproach them with that might be a good sarcasm; but it was fatal to the correctness of the reasoning of those who used it. the sarcasm was irreconcileable with the argument. If the Lords were prepared to make such sacrifices; if the Ministers could carry schedule A, why, he would ask, did they not make the experiment, and try if schedule A could be carried? There are peculiar instances which make it proper in our discussions to refrain from noticing what occurs in another place; but though feeling that such notice, if drawn into a precedent, would be fatal to all order, yet there are occasions when we may do so, and I believe it is notorious that upwards of seventy Peers signed the protest against the second reading of the Reform Bill; and it was also notorious that a great number of those who voted for the second reading voted for the postponement of schedule A. Among them were Lord Wharncliffe and the Earl of Harrowby, and a great number—I may perhaps say fifty—who were prepared to affirm, without recurring to schedule A, that the system of Government could no longer be carried on by means of nomination boroughs. If the House of Lords were resigned to permit that large Reform, why not accept it? Suppose some difference should arise about schedule B, the great object was stated to be to get rid of the small nomination boroughs; and supposing the Peers to concede schedule A, could it be believed that it would be impossible to reconcile the country to a modified Bill? The question before us arises out of a proposition made to the other House, that schedule A be postponed. I admit that this question involves, at least in the minds of the authors of the Bill a principle of importance. By some persons it is said that the nomination boroughs are a blot and a defect on the Constitution, which are incompatible with its recognized principles, and that they must be abated as a nuisance. They would on that ground alone destroy them. The other party said, that care and caution were necessary in disfranchising them, and would not admit that disfranchisement should precede enfranchisement, and they, therefore, proposed to postpone the disfranchising clause. Suppose that the ultimate consequence had been, to disfranchise these nomination boroughs; as far as that particular object is concerned, is it to be believed that the people would have stood out on the point whether schedule A should be first considered or not? By not waiting, at all events, the Ministers had showed that there was nothing palpable but a difference of degree, and they can of course show no necessity for the extraordinary step they recommended. Admitting, therefore, which I do not admit, that a creation of Peers to carry a particular measure would be justifiable in certain circumstances, I say that you have failed in making out any case of urgent necessity; I, repeat, therefore, that I cannot do otherwise than condemn the advice which it is understood was given to the Crown. I repeat, also, in as courteous language as possible, that I think the course which the Government has pursued has far from tended to control the expectations of the people, or to induce them to take that calm and modified view of this great question of Parliamentary Reform which was so desireable. On the contrary, I think that the line of conduct they have adopted, ever since they have been in office, by their declarations and by their correspondence, instead of assuaging, has only tended to raise those expectations, and to lengthen the period of the excitement which we must all have wished to avoid. Considering all the circumstances of the case, if ever there were a set of men who were studiously bound to avoid placing their Sovereign in a situation of difficulty, by resigning their offices, never were there a set of men who had stronger motives for avoiding such conduct than his Majesty's Ministers. In the first Resolution, therefore, I cannot agree; and most cordially do I agree with my hon. friend, the member for Thetford (Mr. Baring), in meeting that Resolution with a direct negative, abstaining from availing ourselves of any of the courtesies by which the pain of meeting a Motion by a direct negative is avoided. The first Resolution expresses an adherence to his Majesty's Government; I vote against it because I see no reason for the House of Commons expressing any such adherence. The second Resolution merely quotes a passage from the Speech from the Throne, and describes an opinion of the House of Commons already expressed on the Reform Bill, and of course to that opinion the majority will adhere, and will repeat it. I pass it by as not requiring remark. The third Resolution is to this effect—" That to the progress of the measure, this House considers itself bound to state to his Majesty, that his subjects are looking with the most intense interest and anxiety." But why express the whole of his Majesty's subjects, when it is well known that a great difference of opinion prevails amongst them, and that many of of them are opposed to this measure? The Resolution, however, goes on to say, " that they cannot disguise from his Majesty their apprehensions that any successful attempt to mutilate or impair the efficiency of the Bill will be productive of the greatest disappointment and dismay." Now, what are the circumstances? We have sent a bill up to the other House—that is a formal proceeding; that Bill has been read a second time; but a difference of opinion has existed as to the collocation of certain clauses; is it right in the House of Commons now to pledge themselves, under no circumstances, to admit of modifications in that Bill? I call on the House to consider the precedent they will set if they agree to this Resolution. Let it be applied to other bills. We send up a bill to the House of Lords, and before the House of Lords can consider it, we send up an address to the Crown, praying that the Bill may not be mutilated, and declaring that we will consent to no mutilation. Is this a fitting course for the House of Commons? Is it a proper exercise of its functions? Why, we will not allow the Peers to exercise any right of dissent, not merely from our Bill, but even from the collocation of its clauses. Is that not interfering with the other House of Parliament? This is not a question as to the conduct of Ministers, it is a question between the two Houses of Parliament relative to a bill pending before the other House; and on a matter of so much delicacy, without consulting the Journals of that House, resting merely on common fame, the House of Commons is called on to address the Crown not to suffer any mutilation of the

Bill. We are called upon to state to the Crown that no other bill but this will satisfy the people. But the power of the Government itself will be destroyed by that Bill. No Government can exist which does not control and restrain the popular sentiments; and no restraints can exist if Government is to look for support to a House of Commons, which, being the express image of the people, would, after the example of this precedent, send up an address to the Crown requesting that a bill before the Lords shall not be mutilated and rendered less efficient. It is certainly a most dangerous proceeding for a Government first to rouse the passions of the people upon the subject of a particular bill, until disappointment becomes almost impossible, and then to send it to the Lords, and address the Throne not to permit their Lordships the free exercise of their functions. Now, then, let us see what is the last Resolution. There is a majority in this House in favour of Reform; they may, probably, think that these are merely Resolutions pledging the House to adhere to their former opinions: they are no such thing. This last Resolution is, in substance, neither more nor less than a dictation to the Crown. I call particular attention to this Resolution. It was only yesterday we had notice of the Motion of the noble Lord, and this day we are called upon to pledge ourselves to the dangerous course of not submitting, under any circumstances, to the mutilation of a measure which is now under the consideration of another branch of the Legislature. The words of the Resolution are:—'That this House is, therefore, impelled by the warmest attachment to his Majesty's person and Throne, humbly, but most earnestly, to implore his Majesty to call to his councils such persons only as will carry into effect, unimpaired in all its essential provisions, that Bill for the reform of the Representation of the people which has recently passed this House.' If the House agree to this Resolution it will completely dictate to the Crown who is to serve it. Combined with the other Resolutions, it will establish a most dangerous precedent. One Resolution pledges the House not to admit of any mutilation of the Bill; and this Resolution addresses his Majesty not to call to his councils any persons who will not carry it into effect unimpaired in all its principal provisions. The Resolutions, then, together, tell the Crown that the only persons proper to serve it are those persons who will carry into effect the Bill. I wish to ask, first, if you think it proper to call on the Crown, on appointing Ministers, to require pledges of them? Is it right, on the Crown appointing any of its servants, that it should require of them, not only that their opinions should be generally stated on any point, but should refuse to allow them to form their opinions as the exigency of any case might require, and should insist on their pledging themselves beforehand to all the details of every measure? These are new principles; and I shall prove that, though now emitted, there is high authority against them. In 1807, a Government went out of office, of which the present Government is the natural successor and inheritor of its political opinions; that Government retired from office, not because the King would not consent to the bill admitting Catholics to Parliament—for that bill was withdrawn in deference to the scruples of the King—but because his Majesty required Lords Grenville and Grey, while they continued in office, that they should make no proposition of a similar nature. They answered that they would not fetter themselves by any such pledge; that the public safety must be their law; and they must be left at liberty to act according to the exigencies of the times. How was the pledge they were now called on to address his Majesty to exact, different from this? It was calling on his Majesty to exact a pledge from his servants both as to principles and as to details. What were the Resolutions proposed in the House of Commons and Lords in 1807? Those Resolutions expressed the opinion of Earl Grey and his friends at that period, and it would be useful to quote at least one of them, as showing what was then the opinion of the present Ministers as to exacting pledges. The Resolution moved by the Marquis of Stafford, in the House of Lords in 1807, was this:—"That this House, feeling the necessity of a firm and stable Government in this most important crisis of public affairs, is impressed with the deepest regret at the change which has taken place in his Majesty's councils, and that this regret is greatly increased by the causes to which the change has been ascribed; it being the opinion of this House, that it is contrary to the first duties of the responsible Ministers of the King to restrain themselves by any pledge, expressed or implied, from submitting to his Majesty faithfully and truly, any advice, which, in their judgment, the course of circumstances may render necessary for the honour of his Majesty's Crown, and the welfare of his dominions."* I call upon the House to contrast the Resolutions which I have just read with those now proposed. What the present Resolution dictates, the Resolution of 1807 strongly deprecated. The Crown is called upon to exact a pledge from its Ministers to carry the Reform Bill into effect in all its essential principles of representation. The Crown, Sir, acting upon these Resolutions, would be compelled to say to any person who might be honoured by his Majesty's selection, you must pledge yourself to carry these principles into complete effect, before I can admit you into my service—no matter how pregnant they may be with danger to the country—no matter in what disputes they were likely to involve both Houses of Parliament. No man, Sir, could, with any propriety of feeling, accept office on such terms. In 1807, there was no attempt to require any pledges as to the details of the measure. I consider it a violation of the Constitution itself to call on the King to require those who may be about to enter his service to give such pledges. On these grounds, therefore, I feel it my duty to oppose these three Resolutions. The noble Lord has referred to the precedent of 1812, but when Lord Wharncliffe brought forward his motion, a proposition had been made to Mr. Canning to enter the Ministry which had failed; another negotiation, however, had succeeded and it was then matter of notoriety who was to be the Minister. But here we are not only to call upon the Crown to appoint an efficient Government, but, by these Resolutions, are required to dictate to it the principles on which that Government is to be carried on, and in reality the persons of whom it is to be composed. In my opinion, there is neither necessity nor justification for entering into these Resolutions. When this House shall be modelled upon the principles of the Bill brought in by the hon. Gentlemen opposite, then, I have no doubt, they will find a ready disposition to violate and encroach on the prerogatives of the other branches of the Legislature. When such language is made use of as I have heard to-night, I doubt not that the most ardent anticipations of hon. Gentlemen opposite will be fully realized. I cannot but deprecate, to the utmost of my power, the establishment of such a precedent—a precedent which I consider to be opposed to the principles of the Constitution, and to the welfare of the nation itself.

Mr. *O'Connell* spoke as follows. The right hon. Baronet appears to me quite inconsistent in his observations. First, Sir, he makes an open and avowed declaration against all Reform, that is, against the power of the people honestly and truly expressing their sentiments in this House; and then he is apprehensive that they will obtain that power to which they are entitled: he declares that he will oppose them, and then he thinks that they will be able to beat him. I am delighted to find that such a declaration has been made by the right hon. Baronet. I am rejoiced that he has expressed himself so clearly and distinctly upon this point. I am glad that, so far as he is concerned, there can no longer be any delusion upon this subject, for he tells the people this most important fact, that from no Administration of which that right hon. Baronet forms a part, is Reform to be expected. Upon the part which I myself have taken respecting the Reform Bill, I can feel but one regret, and that is for having consented to so high a qualification as 10*l*. From the feelings which appear to have actuated many Gentlemen, and from the part that I have seen them act, I can have but one regret, and that is, to my consenting, not to so low a qualification, but to so high a qualification as that of 10*l*. Had I, Sir, been aware, when I agreed to that qualification, that it would extend no further the right of suffrage than I have since found it does, I certainly never should have consented to it. And it is my hope, nay, my confident expectation, that should the Reform Bill again come back to this House, the people will insist upon a much larger, more extensive Bill, one that will confer still greater rights and privileges upon them, than were conceded in the Reform Bill already agreed to by this House. The resolutions which are now before this House, have my most hearty assent, and they shall have whatever support I can give them. I thank the right hon. Baronet for putting these resolutions upon their proper ground. He has most truly stated, that these resolutions mean to express our confidence in his Majesty's Ministers; they most certainly mean that; and also, that we intend to express that confidence, on account of their conduct, in giving to his Majesty that advice which they have lately tendered to him. Such is the meaning, and such the intention of the resolutions. The hon. member for Worcester has frequently felt it to be his duty to differ from his Majesty's Ministers. I, too, have differed from them upon many occasions, but especially concerning the manner in which they have governed Ireland, and the measures they have proposed respecting that country; but, though I have done so, I feel it to be necessary, and so does the hon. member for Worcester, to vote for these resolutions, and, upon this ground, that they express our confidence in the Ministers for the advice which they have given to his Majesty. I agree to these resolutions, because I concur in the wisdom of the advice they gave to the King. I agree to these resolutions, because I am convinced that it was necessary for them to tender the advice to the King which they have offered him. I agree to these resolutions upon such grounds, without further committing myself, by that declaration of confidence, than such grounds can commit me. The right hon. Baronet has addressed a speech to this House, which does not seem to me to be at all suited to the occasion on which he has delivered it. The right hon. Baronet should have recollected that we are not now engaged in a war of words between two parties. This is not a question of Whig and Tory—whether the one is to continue in place, and the other to remain out of it. It is not a question as to who is to have the gift of office and the exercise of patronage. No; it is a question between slavery and freedom. It is a struggle between liberty and despotism. It is a conflict between the ruthless despotism of a selfish oligarchy, and the ardent, the enthusiastic, hopes of a free-born and brave people. Yes, I repeat it, the question is now between freedom and the despotism, the ruthless despotism, of a sordid oligarchy. The unconstitutional power assumed by a sordid and worthless oligarchy to nominate Members of Parliament, has twice been condemned by overwhelming majorities of this House. The power has been denounced by this House, and let it be recollected, that, as often as the Speaker takes the Chair in this House, at the commencement of the Session, it is declared to be a gross infringement of the rights and liberty of the subject for any Peer to interfere in the election of Members of this House, and yet, in spite of these declarations, in open and shameless violation of them, the nominees of Peers continue to occupy seats in this House. They do so as the nominees of Peers, and not as Representatives of the people. The question, then, is not a party one, it is not one of Whig or Tory, but whether so atrocious a system of flagrant corruption and open violation of the Constitution is to be perpetuated, or put an end to. I repeat it, then, this is a question between liberty and despotism; whether the Lords are to continue to control this House, or the people to obtain an increase of power in their own House? There is, however, another question to be considered. The security of the Throne is now involved; for, let the Members here delude themselves as they please, the people are unanimous out of doors. Some people, indeed, talk of a reaction. But where are we to see that reaction? The question of Reform has been before this House for eighteen months. Has there been an attempt made at any public meeting to discuss petitions against Reform? Has there been in England, Scotland, or Ireland, a single public open meeting against the principle of Reform? The people, therefore, so far as they are concerned, have proved their partiality to Reform. They have declared that corruption is not to continue; and does the House think that that disposition is abated? Have the people of England relaxed in their determination? Are the symptoms of it to be perceived at any meeting since the House of Lords have, by their dexterity, rendered it essential for his Majesty's Ministers to bring on the crisis which they have wisely brought on? They anticipated the dexterity of their enemies. I can understand clearly from the right hon. Baronet what he wished. He wished to drag on the Ministry for a fortnight or three weeks amidst vain hopes, idle expectations, and loss of the confidence of the public. How can any man tell me, that Gentlemen deserving of the confidence of the public, or who had any confidence in themselves, could allow a bill to proceed, the conduct of which was taken away from them? They would from that moment have been degraded in their own feelings, and condemned by the unanimous voice of the people, if they had kept their situations without taking adequate means for the success of the measure. They were responsible to the people for the Bill, and how could they continue in office without making the measure what it ought to be? I cannot, therefore, but commend the Ministers for the advice they have given. Now let the House see whether that advice was wise and proper. Calculations have been made as to the number of Peers that would be necessary, and the hon. member for Middlesex has been taunted for having said he would have created 100 Peers, if it were necessary, to carry the Reform Bill. Would any Ministers have been so absurd as to go to the King with a half-measure, and ask him for a given number of Peers, without knowing whether that number would be sufficient? That would have been too absurd. Their enemies would have rejoiced at their having taken that line, as their friends rejoiced at their having scorned it, and asked for an adequate number of Peers to carry the measure. But the House is told that this would be a dangerous precedent. It is not asserted that the thing is exactly unconstitutional. I should have wished that the right hon. Baronet had supplied me with that argument, for I have a strong recollection that, at the time of a measure called the Union, one-third was added to the Irish House of Peers, to enable the Minister of the day to carry that measure. And, if that was done to extinguish the rights of a free and independent nation, shall I be told that it is not to be done to revive the liberties of England? The precedent is good for me, but bad for the right hon. Baronet. At this moment Peers have influence in this House. A Peer from Ireland, who voted against the Reform Bill, nominated another individual, and sent him to this House to vote against it also. This House has declared against the system, but the Peers say they will not give it up. They say, "We are the majority, and we will keep the nominating power." And how is this difficulty to be got rid of? It may be got rid of by force. I recollect that, at a Reform meeting, somebody suggested that the Augean stable of the Lords should be cleansed, by turning the river into it, when another person proposed, as an amendment, that instead of turning the river into the House of Lords, the Lords should be turned into the river. This is certainly one way of getting rid of the difficulty; it is to be commended for its expedition, though not for its consonance to the Constitution. That certainly is not the mode that I would either support or adopt—so far from recommending, I would dissuade the people from adopting that mode. His Majesty's Ministers have recommended a different mode. No force or violence is reconcileable with a constitutional mode of proceeding. They cannot overpower the House of Lords by any other branch than the Crown. On such an occasion it is reserved for the Crown constitutionally to get rid of the difficulty, instead of turning the river into the Lords, or the Lords into the river, by exercising its power of creating the number of Peers, and sending into that House Members who have no selfish interest, no boroughmongering interest, and who are able to vote disinterestedly, and therefore honestly. The Lords, therefore, need neither be sluiced by the river, nor thrown into the river, but may retain their existence to its full extent. I regret to hear that any influence has been exercised to induce the Crown to reject this advice. I do not think that they were very enviable persons who exercised such influence; but if a new Ministry were to be formed in despite and contempt of this House, and if an Anti-reforming Ministry be appointed, it will be in contempt of this House, and of the British people, I cannot conceive it possible to look without apprehension to the consequences, and without regret for the conduct of those who have brought the country to such a state, from the supposition that the people of England will be satisfied without an ample measure of Reform. There never was a grosser delusion than to imagine that the people of England will suffer their Bill to be mutilated; and those who expect, that what is called the good sense of the people will put down their desire for Reform, reason rashly and unwisely, and will find themselves greatly deceived by the event. It is said, that these Resolutions are unconstitutional, in calling upon the King to require a pledge, and the precedent of 1807 is referred to—the most unfortunate precedent which the right hon. Baronet could have selected. It would be too much to expect Tories to read history; but do they understand their own story? Do they understand their own acts? Do they understand their own tale? In 1807 the cry was raised of "the Church in Danger," and

---

* Hansard, vol. ix. p. 352.

"no Popery," and the country was excited from one end to the other. The Ministry went out, and the Tories came in triumphantly. But did they put an end to the Catholic question? Did they put an end to agitation? Did they succeed in their objects? No. They gave the country twenty-five years of agitation, confusion, and disturbance; they absorbed the public attention from every other important subject, and they ended by being disgracefully beaten. That is the history, the short epitome, of Toryism: they had to do with the patient people of Ireland: I repeat it: they had to do with the most patient people on the face of the earth. Even the sneering contempt with which a reference to their patience is heard, only proves to me, that their forbearance endured not only injury and oppression, but base insult. They have done so, and they succeeded, without violating one law, or committing one crime; for I defy any one to point out a single crime committed by any one who has been active in asserting the rights of Ireland. I much doubt whether they would have so patient a people to deal with in England; and I do not believe they would find them by any means so patient in Scotland. Let the right hon. Baronet, therefore, make the utmost of his precedent of 1807. But is it so unconstitutional to require a pledge? Were no pledges required from Ministers in 1807? Have there been no pledges against liberty since that time? Will the right hon. Baronet tell me, that Administrations have not been looked for, whose principles were known to be hostile to freedom? And will any man refuse to pledge himself to his own principles, unless, indeed, he intends to forsake them? That would be an admirable Tory distinction. But I entertain a perfect conviction, that any man who would violate his principles, would throw in the pledge too; he would not be the more bound by it. The objection certainly should never come from those who have broken their pledges to a party—who deluded their followers into one line of policy, and then adopted for themselves another. It does not appear to me, that there would be anything unconstitutional whatever in the King's ascertaining the principles of the Ministers, and calling upon them, before they held office,t o become Reformers. The present Ministers came into office as Reformers. On their coming into office, they pledged themselves distinctly to Reform, and, by continuing such Ministers in office, the King was himself pledged to the carrying of Reform. I do not mean to say, that the King has violated that pledge, for the King, of course, can do no wrong; but those irresponsible persons have much to answer for, through whose advice his Majesty is now placed in such a situation as to appear opposed to Reform. I am glad, Sir, to find, that his Majesty's Ministers have acted as they have done. If they were endeavouring to create a good opportunity for retiring from office, they could not have selected a better one than the present. The Ministry have retired from office, but they have done so with their characters pure and unsullied, and they have done so with the public confidence in them undiminished. Soon, Sir, I hope to see them returning again to power—to power which they have endeavoured to exercise for the good of the people, and which I hope they will be enabled to wield much more efficiently and effectually than they have yet been able to do, for the permanent and full accomplishment of the desires, the wishes, and the just demands of a great, an enlightened, and a brave people.

Lord *Sandon* was understood to say, that, if the address was meant to imply approbation of the advice to allow the Ministers to create an unlimited number of Peers, as seemed to be implied by the speeches of most of the Members, unless his noble friend disavowed that interpretation so different from the sense in which he understood the Resolutions, he should be compelled not to vote in favour of the Resolutions.

Mr. *Macaulay* observed, that, in the course of the last eighteen months, they had often been on the verge of anarchy; but, until this crisis, he had never known what it was to be once anxious on the subject of political affairs. If ever there was a time which called for the firmness, honesty, wisdom, or energy, of a political assembly—if ever there was a question in which the interest of the community was involved, that time was the present—that question was the question of his noble friend. Amidst all his anxiety, however, there was ample cause for joy. He remembered with delight the noble conduct which that House had pursued from the day they first met in that place up to the present moment; and he anticipated with confidence that the majority would adhere to that noble line of conduct which was indispensable to their own honour, and the safety of the commonweal. It was pleasing to reflect that they had still leaders to whom they could look up with confidence and pride, that those leaders were deserving of the support which they had given them, and who had fallen, indeed, but it was with unblemished honour. Amidst the dark events by which they were surrounded, there was this consolation—their sincerity as Statesmen had been put to the test, and it was not found wanting. By the voice of the people they were brought into power—by that voice they were supported in power—and they retired from power rather than betray the people who trusted them. They would thus carry with them to their retirement—and very brief he trusted it would be—the proud satisfaction that their conduct was fully appreciated by the people. He did not feel bound, on the present occasion, to enter into any discussion on the subject of Reform, but he should address himself at once to the particular Motion before the House. He was sure that the right hon. Baronet opposite must, on a little reflection, see that he was wrong in asserting that that House had no right to interfere with the prerogative of the King in the choice of his Ministers. It appeared to him that there was nothing more in accordance with the principles of the Constitution—nothing for which there could not be found more numerous examples in the best times of our history—than the course which was now proposed to be adopted by the House, namely, the respectfully offering its suggestions to the Sovereign as to the choice of his Ministers. The appointment of his Ministers undoubtedly belonged to the Sovereign, but it was a clear constitutional doctrine, to which he did not know a single exception, that, with respect to every prerogative of the King, that House had the right respectfully to offer its advice and its suggestions to the Sovereign. That was a position, he was sure, which a person of the constitutional knowledge of the right hon. Baronet would not feel disposed to dispute, and he was equally sure that it would not be denied that, under certain circumstances, that House had a right to offer its advice to the Sovereign as to the persons whom it judged fit to fill the offices of his Ministers, as it had often suggested to the King the names of persons fit to fill offices in the Church, or fit, on account of their services in the army or navy, to fill any public offices under the Crown. He, therefore, laid down this as a position that would not be controverted, that the House had a right, with respect to the prerogative of the Sovereign in the choice of his Ministers, as with regard to all the other prerogatives of the Crown, to offer its respectful advice. He undoubtedly did understand the present Resolution as a recommendation to his Majesty to retain his present Ministers. He could not see how it could be otherwise understood, for he could not discover any other materials from which such a Ministry as that which they recommended to his Majesty could be formed. "But," said the hon. member for Thetford, "the Ministers had voluntarily retired from office, and the House, in adopting such a Resolution as this, would be advising his Majesty to force office on men who would not undertake it." Surely such a sophism was unworthy of the acute mind of that hon. Member. When we advise the King to take back his Ministers, we also advise him to take back their advice with them. That was what he (Mr. Macaulay) meant by the vote which he would give on this Motion, and he was sure it was on such an understanding that it would be supported by a majority of that House. Now, as to the objection raised to the creation of Peers, it amounted, if he understood it right, to this—that a creation of Peers, for the purpose of carrying a measure, even of the most vital importance, went to destroy the authority and weight of the House of Lords, and was, therefore, indefensible upon any principle of the Constitution. He conceived that the prerogative vested in the Crown, of creating Peers, for the purpose of carrying any public question, was a valuable and useful power, the existence of which was absolutely necessary, in order, on important occasions, to obviate great and pressing inconveniences. He believed it would be found that the exercise of such a power was in accordance with the principles of the Constitution, as laid down by the greatest constitutional writers on all sides and of all parties. A reference to Swift, on the one side, to Walpole and Steele on the other, and to De Lolme as a middle and impartial authority, would satisfactorily bear out that assertion, and would prove that the Constitution did not recognize any branch of the Legislature existing as the House of Lords would exist if this prerogative were not vested in the Crown, with uncontrolled and irresponsible power. They knew that kings had fallen upon erroneous courses, and what had happened in the case of an hereditary monarchy might happen in the case of an hereditary nobility. We had had a James 2nd, and it was not beyond the range of possibility that we might have a House of Lords full of high spirit, imbued with prejudices that could not be overcome; and, unfortunately, opposed to the wishes and feelings of the people, and was there to be no means of remedying such a state of things? The Constitution afforded the means of dealing with a factious and perverse opposition on the part of the House of Commons, for the King could dissolve the Parliament, and appeal to the people, at a time when he might think that appeal would stand the best chance of success. Again, that House had a check upon the King, for it could refuse the supplies; and was there to be no check at all upon the House of Lords? Was there any thing in the Constitution of that illustrious assembly—the House of Lords—which exempted it from the necessity of some similar controlling check? If that power, which was subject to abuse from Kings and Commons, could never be abused by Dukes or Earls, the best course was, to leave the whole Government in the hands of so pure, wise, and virtuous an assembly, to abolish the Monarchy, and to dissolve themselves. But, if this were not the case, was it not monstrous to imagine that the House of Lords should be exempt from some check like that to which both King and Commons are subject? Were there no check, the only appeal of the people could be to physical force; but, fortunately, the Constitution affords the means required, by conferring on the King the prerogative of making Peers. He admitted that there was some danger that the power might be abused; but of two dangers, he thought it proper to choose the least; and when they remembered that the Ministers who advised the creation of Peers would be responsible for that advice, he thought it a power not much likely to be abused. Unless some one could bring in a Peerage Bill much less liable to objection than the Peerage Bill of Lord Sunderland, he thought the King's prerogative a useful one, and one which, at this period, he was called upon to exert. As to impeachment, which had been spoken of, who would venture to impeach the Ministers for a step absolutely essential to the welfare of the kingdom? This exercise of the Royal prerogative might be necessary, too, for the preservation of the very existence of the other estates of the realm, and justified on grounds of the purest public policy. Let them suppose a case in which the two Houses were placed in direct and immediate collision by an uniform and continued difference of opinion on every question. Suppose the House of Lords was to be for war, and the House of Commons for peace—suppose the House of Commons to be for one Ministry, and the House of Lords for another—suppose, too, the struggles consequent on these differences of opinion to be continued—suppose that they lasted throughout an entire Session of Parliament—suppose that they were found so inveterate as to be incurable even by a dissolution of the House of Commons—why, what, he would ask, must be the consequence of such a state of things? That the whole machinery of Government must be stopped unless his Majesty exercised his prerogative by giving one of the parties a predominance. The Government must in such a case stand still, or new Peers must be created. But, then, it is urged against this creation the monstrous, anomaly of which you would be guilty by concurring in the creation of Peers merely to give one party an ascendancy over the other on a particular question. He would ask them to look a little more narrowly into that question. He thought he should be able to show that it was a course just, reasonable, and perfectly defensible on all principles of law and of equity. If the objections were so strong to the creation of a large number of Peers in one day, were there none to the creation of more than two hundred in less than half of a century. Suppose that one party holding power for nearly fifty years ennobled, from time to time, nearly two hundred of its own supporters, while all others were passed by; suppose all the Peers for that period to be chosen from one faction, while all rank was denied to the other; was there anything so monstrously unconstitutional in that other party setting themselves right in the political balance, and resuming that station in the House of Lords to which they were entitled when they obtained the ascendancy? If it was unconstitutional for the Whigs, when they obtained power, to resume that balance of influence in the House of Lords, of which the long tenure of office by their adversaries had deprived them, then the inevitable result must be, that the possession of political ascendancy for thirty or forty years, would be a possession for ever. It was no longer a question of public opinion or political rectitude, but it must be a question of whether one party or the other had been longest in office; of whether Mr. Pitt or Mr. Fox held the Premiership in 1800; or Lord Grey or Lord Liverpool presided over the Cabinet in 1820. The upholding of such doctrines was not to be tolerated even for an instant. It would make the present generation the mere slaves of the past, and be utterly inconsistent with the first principles of politics. But the matter might be placed on still stronger grounds than that. Suppose this party, holding power so long, to have adhered to principles tending one way, while public opinion was constantly and rapidly verging towards the other; suppose the party which possessed a majority in the House of Lords to be devoted to a course of policy directly contrary to the feelings and wishes of the nation; suppose, in fact, the House of Lords and the nation to have been during the whole of that period moving in diverging directions; supposing, as the result, an overwhelming majority in favour of the one course in the House of Commons, and an equally overwhelming majority in favour of a different course in the House of Lords; he did not mean to say that this state of things was decidedly injurious to the Crown or to the country, or that it might not arise out of the working of the Constitution; but, then, he would ask them in such a case to look at the situation of the Lords. The House of Lords was not strictly a representative body, nor did he contend that it should be so; but it must, nevertheless, be mixed up a little with the other classes of the country, and have some connection and affinity with the general interests of that people from whom they derived their wealth and importance. Under such circumstances as he had attempted to describe, to add to the number of the House of Lords out of the great mass of the intelligence and respectability of the country would not impair, but, on the contrary, extend their influence—would not swamp, but, on the contrary, support their power and independence. This was his view of the condition in which they were placed, and he saw no other course left for them to adopt than by a large addition to the numbers of the House of Lords from the supporters of that party so long excluded from power, to place the Aristocracy in harmony with the other institutions of the State. It appeared to him that everything was in favour of this creation—the letter of the law and the strongest reasons of public policy. The power of the King to exercise his prerogative for the purpose was undoubted; and the letter of the law was in harmony with the letter of the highest law of all—the safety of the State. He, therefore, for once concurred most cordially in the Motion of the noble Lord, and concurred with him also in the expressions of regret for the retirement of those who had supported the Reform Bill, and in his desire that none should be looked for as their successors who were not prepared to give that Bill their unqualified concurrence. If that Government, which had supported the Reform Bill with so much zeal and so much sincerity, did not return to office, then he would say the Bill was lost to the country. Lost, he would say, because he could not conjecture how those who would then have the management of it, could, even in a mutilated form (for mutilated it would be), consent that it should be carried. That the hon. Members who sat on the benches opposite should attempt to carry such a Bill seemed to him utterly impossible; and, although one or two expressions which fell from them might bear the interpretation of such an intention, he could not believe they were spoken in earnest. He would not go back to the history of East Retford in 1829 and 1830. He would take a much later period. He would speak of those who abandoned office not eighteen months ago—who resigned their places because they were hostile to all Reform whatever. He would speak of those who, from the 1st of March, when the first Bill was introduced, down to the final dismissal of the second Bill to the House of Lords, attacked all its provisions with the most inveterate hostility; who stigmatized all disfranchisement as robbery, and all enfranchisement as usurpation; and who bellowed Universal Suffrage as a means of terror into the ears of the rich, and declaimed about 10*l.* Aristocracy to the poor. It was of these hon. Members and their party he spoke; and he could not think it possible that they would so descend as to give their support and countenance to the Reform Bill. He believed they had too much honesty; he believed they had too strong a sense of shame. The inconsistency of the act would be too glaring—the time was too short—the memory of their former professions was too recent—the motive would be too obvious. He could not trust himself to believe that the party of which he spoke could entertain an idea of supporting the Reform Bill. The party, then, that—if they accepted office—could carry the Reform Bill, would not carry it; and there remained only that other party which might be disposed to attempt it, but who were much too powerless and insignificant to form an Administration. He did not mean to designate those attached to that party offensively, but the House probably understood that he alluded to those who were commonly known by the name of the "waverers." From that party, he apprehended, it was utterly impossible to select a number of men who could conduct the public business of the House of Commons. The case, then, stood thus: those who might support the Bill could not form a Government; and those who could form a Government could not support the Bill with any regard to their public character, or with any respect to political consistency, unless with the introduction of most extensive amendments. The Bill he regarded, therefore, as lost; and, on the whole, he thought it better it should be lost than suffer mutilation in the hands of its enemies, and be drained of that which they called its venom, but which he considered its life-blood. The Members of his side of the House had been accused of making prophecies which they accomplished themselves, and no one had been more subjected to these accusations than he had. They had been accused of prophesying the agitation which they endeavoured to excite. The fault of that argument was, that it might be used at all times, with the same success, whenever a deliberative assembly was warned of the dangers which awaited its decisions. It was the duty, however, of those who believed such dangers existed to speak out, and to speak boldly. If they spoke for the purpose of exciting discontent, they were guilty of a great crime; but his conscience acquitted him of any such intention. He knew that he was as anxious as any man for the preservation of order and the security of property. He knew that he was prepared to contend as strongly against the errors of the people as to argue for their rights; and he would, at all times, rather be the victim of their injustice than its instrument. The time, however, might come when those who derided the warning would be sensible of its value—when those who laughed at the danger might witness the evils they could no longer avert—when those who despised all advice might feel themselves bereft of all relief. The time might come when the candid but unpretending counsel of a Cordelia would be found preferable to the bold but crafty recommendations of a Goneril. Let the Legislature depend on those who boldly declared their opinions as to the danger of rejecting Reform, rather than upon the smooth-tongued Conservatives; the former, he contended, were the only true Conservatives. He would not cry "peace, peace," when "there was no peace." As to those who might attempt to play the part of a Polignac ministry in England, and endeavour to carry on the affairs of the State without public confidence, nay, in direct opposition to the sentiments of the people, he told those individuals that they had to do with a people more firm and determined than the French, and he warned them to take care how they ventured on the attempt. Why, the ink was scarcely yet dry of the protests which noble Lords had entered against the Reform Bill. Their speeches were yet ringing in the people's ears, in which they denounced the measure, and would they attempt to take office? In attempting to administer the Government they were so eager to grasp, they must either shamelessly desert the whole of their former protestations, or go in direct opposition to the wishes of the majority of that House. And, even if they could succeed in overcoming the majority of that House, they would still have dangers before them from which Mr. Pitt would have shrunk, and even an Earl of Strafford have hesitated to encounter. They would go forth to the contest with public opinion without arms either offensive or defensive. If they had recourse to force they would find it vain

—if they attempted gagging Bills they would be derided: in short, they would, in taking office, present a most miserable exhibition of impotent ambition, and appear as if they wished to show to the world a melancholy example of little men bringing a great empire to destruction. In this perilous hour he would call on the House of Commons to remember the high mission with which they stood charged—to remember the important privileges with which they were invested. Now, at the hour when a paltry faction, elated by a momentary triumph, were, on the one hand, preparing to destroy all the hopes of the people, and the enemies of social order, on the other hand, were rejoicing in the prospect of anarchy and confusion—now, at this eventful hour, he implored them to rise in the grandeur of their hearts, and save a Sovereign misled by evil counsel—save a nobility insensible to their own welfare or true interests—save the country, of which they were the guardians, from a disastrous convulsion, and save, he would say, the hive of industry, the mart of the whole world, the centre of civilization—from confusion and anarchy. Their vote of that night would, he trusted, revive industry, and restore confidence. It would place out of all possibility of danger the public peace; it would stay political dissensions, and, by averting the calamities with which they were threatened, preserve the authority of the law, and uphold the Majesty of the Crown.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* professed himself unable to come to a vote which would imply confidence in a Government that engaged itself for the payment of the Russian Loan, and meanly evaded the provisions of the Foreign Enlistment bill. The noble Lord who made the Motion that night had observed, that Earl Grey could not, after the vote of Monday evening, retain his place, in order to be cuffed and battered about by a majority of the Tories; but the noble Lord, the leader of the Government phalanx in the Lower House, had allowed himself to be cuffed and battered about on the subject of his Budget, and yet he still clung to his office. One by one had the items of that Budget disappeared—vanished "like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wreck behind;" and yet that noble Lord had not resigned. The noble Lord in the Upper House should have followed the example of the noble Lord in the Lower, rather than abandon his office under such circumstances. When the noble Lord (Ebrington) announced his intention to make the Motion now before the House, the noble Lord (Althorp) told him, he thought he was wrong, and advised him to abstain from the course he had adopted. That advice was perfectly consistent with the noble Lord's upright and candid character; but he should have gone further; he should have adjourned the House rather than allow the noble Lord to take a course so embarrassing to the Crown—so totally unprecedented in the annals of Parliament. He did not mean to say, when the noble Lord himself disclaimed it, that there was any connection between him and the Government: but when he recollected that the noble Lord had once before, on the rejection of the Bill, signalised himself by a similar motion, he must think there was a strong sympathy between him and the Government, which was, rather more than accidental. He hoped, however, that, when the question came to a vote, Ministers would see the propriety of taking no part in the division. It was the practice of the House, when a Member was personally connected with the subject of debate, that such Member should walk out before the decision; and as the present debate had been all personal to the Ministers, and was, in fact, a mere question of whether they should continue to hold office, he hoped they would retire—sail out of the House in a body, the First Lord of the Admiralty leading the van. The object of the Motion was neither more nor less than to keep the Ministry openly and forcibly in possession of their places. He repeated his assertion that, on such a question, with such an object, the five Cabinet Ministers were bound to leave the House on the division. He did not impute design and stratagem; but if there had been design and stratagem for the purpose of replacing Ministers, nothing could have been better contrived. He would now state shortly the reasons why he could not concur in any one of the Resolutions. They consisted of three elementary propositions. The first was a declaration of unabated confidence in Ministers, and regret at their retirement; the second dictated to the Crown the Ministers whom it should call to its councils; the third required that those Ministers should proceed with the whole of the identical Reform Bill which had recently passed that House. Now, really, he could not give unabated confidence, or any confidence at all to Ministers. It had been stated by the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the refusal of the King to make Peers was the cause of the resignation of Ministers; but he had not stated the number of Peers the Ministers advised his Majesty to make. The hon. member for Middlesex had, however, asserted, that sixty or seventy was the smallest number that could be effective. Now, could any rational man regret the retirement from office of Ministers who assigned, as the ground of that retirement, the Royal refusal to create sixty or seventy new Peers? In the case of Lord Oxford such a proceeding was deemed a high crime and misdemeanor. Did hon. Gentlemen, did the Whigs of 1832, mean to repudiate the doctrine held in that case? Instead of condemning the Sovereign for not consenting to this most extraordinary exercise of the Royal prerogative, were he (Sir Charles Wetherell) called upon to pronounce an opinion, he would say, that his Majesty had vindicated his own honour and independence by refusing to commit the great political crime proposed to him. By that refusal he had done himself immortal honour. Yet this advice given by the Ministers, constituted one of the grounds on which the Commons were expected to express regret at the retirement of Ministers. He refused to assent to the Motion, the effect of which would be, to declare that the King had acted wrong, and the Ministers right. He repeated, the demand of Ministers was criminal in its nature, and the King had done himself immortal honour by the courage, firmness, and constancy with which he vindicated himself and the principles of the Constitution. Why send Ministers back to their places? Was it that they might repeat their crime, and renew their solicitations that his Majesty would destroy one of the estates of the realm? The hon. and learned member for Calne had referred to the case of James 2nd, that unhappy Prince who had been expelled, and justly expelled, the Throne for his arbitrary conduct; but, if a hundred Peers were to be thrown at once into the House of Lords, in order to carry a particular measure, there was little difference between the two ignominious cases of arbitrary dictation. It was a mode of operation most offensive to the spirit of the English people; it was a plan by which the House of Lords was to become the nominees of Ministers, and the nominees of those Ministers who professed to hate in their heart and soul the very principle of nomination. How was a body to act *secundum equum et bonum* that was absolutely in the hands of the Ministers—that was bound to decide on a subject, not as it really viewed it, but as the Ministers viewed it? He should now proceed to the second point in the resolution—the dictation to the Crown of what Ministers it should nominate, for that, he contended, was the object of the resolution. In this dangerous public crisis, any man who gave his opinion to the Crown, did it under a sort of intimidation; but he was a recreant, and deserved all the taunts which had been menaced, who refused to give assistance to the Crown because his advice and assistance might be given at some degree of peril to himself. He agreed with his right hon. friend near him (Sir Robert Peel), that that could not be considered a plan of Reform which took away from the Crown the power of selecting its own Ministers. It was the first time—at least in modern days—in which the House of Commons had ventured to tell the King, that he must and should choose as his Ministers those who had retired. It was a most unauthorised, violent, and Radical proposition. They were to tell their Sovereign, forsooth, that the noble Lord opposite, and his colleagues, were the only persons who could carry on the Government of the country; and they were called on to do that after it had been shown, that the only reason why those Ministers had quitted office was, because the House of Lords were desirous of ascertaining what new Members of the House of Commons it might be expedient to create, before they destroyed the old. The noble Lord (Ebrington) had said, that every thing had been expressed with perfect suavity; but he (Sir C. Wetherell) said, nevertheless, that it was a most unauthorized, violent, and Radical resolution. What a bauble, what a folly, was it to talk about the suavity of the expression, when the object of the resolution was, to tell the King that Earl Grey and his colleagues were the only persons who could carry on the public business! It was a mockery on the House, it was a mockery on the public, for Earl Grey, with all his talents—and he admitted his talents, to say—not only "I insist on carrying this measure, but I will also prescribe the exact way in which it shall be carried; I will dictate to the House of Lords what clause shall be carried first, and what second." He must say, that a more ridiculous quarrel, a more absurd cavil, he never heard. Yet that was made the ground of the Minister going to the King, and telling him that he must make a certain number of Peers, who were to be prescribed the very mode and the very series in which the several clauses of the Bill were to be read. They were not only to be told how to vote, but to be prescribed the mode of their voting. There were two ways in which the House of Lords might be rendered useless: one was by at once voting them useless—the other was to make them so, by overwhelming them with a number of new Members. The latter was the mode adopted by the Gentlemen opposite, and though not so revolutionary as the other, it was not less effectual. Practically and essentially they were the same thing. Every one of the three points in the resolution, therefore, was a grievous aggression on the Constitution. If the present House of Commons could venture to tell the King that he shall not choose his own Ministers, and that the Ministers shall pass in the House of Lords the identical Bill this House had sent up to it—if the King, the House of Lords, and the Ministers, were so degraded in this Parliament, how would it be in a Reformed Parliament? If Earl Grey was to complain because the House of Lords would not obey him, was not the dignity of the King affected? Was not the dignity of the whole House of Lords affected? Says Earl Grey, "They shall speak and vote as I will." Were the House of Peers not insulted by this, and by the threat of infusing an addition of Members? If the House of Lords should be overwhelmed by such an infusion—if it were possible that the King could be so criminal as to comply with the demand, he agreed that the time would then be come when the House of Lords ought to be suppressed, for it would be no longer an estate of the realm. If this was a case which was of a peculiar nature, and not to be repeated, that would be no justification; but was it really a precedent that would not be repeated nor followed? Suppose, in a Reformed Parliament, the people desired to have cheap bread, and the House of Lords refused to pass a Corn Bill; and the hon. and learned member for Calne told them that the Lords would not let them have corn at 4*s.* and 5*s.* the bushel. "What!" they would say, "shall the Lords dare to do this? Who are the Lords? They have no interest in the country but their wealth and property. Then, if the House of Lords will not pass the Bill, let Earl Grey call sixty or seventy Peers into the House, as he did before; you have given us in that way a Reformed Parliament, now give us cheap bread." Would the hon. and learned member for Calne—would the hon. member for Middlesex say, that the Political Unions would be satisfied on any other terms? All these consequences were involved in the monstrous and intolerable resolution before the House—a resolution never entertained by a House of Commons since the Civil War. If the gracefulness of the language was to be an excuse for the violence of the act, the conduct of the republicans of that period was justifiable, for their language was humility itself. He congratulated the country that, in the head of the House of Brunswick, they had a Prince who would not copy the example of a Sovereign whose concessions cost him his Crown: he congratulated them that he had refused this oily and smooth violence—this unconstitutional poison—this concealed villainy, under the insidious garb of liberality—this most unmeasured, exorbitant, and unlicensed exercise of prerogative, that would at once have annihilated the House of Lords, and have laid down a principle which might be for ever copied. What was proposed by Earl Grey to-day might be proposed by another Minister to-morrow, which would make the House of Lords the mere dependents of Ministers.

Mr. *Schonswar* hoped, that every man who had voted for Reform would support this Motion, and that there were no waverers who would prostrate themselves before the rising sun.

Mr. *Hunt* begged to say but a very few words. The hon. member for Calne had laid down the proposition, that, if Reform were to be carried at all, it must be by his Majesty's late Ministers. That reminded him very much of the fable of the "Dog in the Manger." As the dog could eat none of the hay himself, he took care that the ox should have none. So it seemed that the Whig Ministers, unable to carry Reform themselves, were determined to take care that no one else should. He believed that the people were anxious for Reform, but he believed that the great body of the well and sound thinking people of this country did not care one rush whether that Reform were carried by Whig or Tory. For his part, he could not place his confidence in a Ministry which, out of office, inveighed against a standing army, but, in office, increased that standing army, not once, but twice, and never diminished it. Neither could he place his confidence in a Ministry which, while it expressed its sympathy for the Poles, actually paid money to Russia, which enabled that country to conquer and subdue the brave patriots of Poland. More than that, he could not place his confidence in a Ministry which had so grossly deceived the people, even upon the question of Reform. Ministers had led the people to believe that the King would sanction any measure, no matter of what kind, to enable them to carry their measure. It was continually put forth by their friends, the Press, that the King, the Commons, and the people, were in favour of that measure. That assertion, so put forward, was never contradicted by Ministers. Then, if the King was not prepared to go the length of carrying the measure, he said that those who were in the secret had misled the country, and, therefore, were not entitled—at least, he could not conscientiously give his vote in favour of resolutions expressive of undiminished confidence in them; he had no doubt but that those resolutions would be carried by a very great majority; and, therefore, he hoped the House would give him credit for conscientious motives in opposing it. What did the Press say? What did that portion of it which, throughout the whole of these discussions, had been friendly to Ministers, say? The *Morning Herald*, which throughout had professed and advocated the principles of the Reform Bill, said, in an article published that day, 'It is clear that a gross deception has been practised upon the country; and let us ask, who have been the parties to that deception? The King's name had undoubtedly been often made use of by the Whig Ministers, in such a way as imposed on the public credulity, and made it be very generally believed, that there were no lengths which the utmost limits of constitutional power embraced, which his Majesty was not prepared to go, with the view of carrying the Reform Bill. The people have been, therefore, grossly deceived.' This was an extract from a paper which hitherto had been staunch in its support of Ministers; and he took the liberty of reading it for the purpose of showing, that he did not stand alone in his opinion—that there was at least one of the editors of the London Press who agreed with him. He said that that man was the best friend of his country, of his Monarch, and his countrymen, who, regardless of all party, lent his consent, aid, and support, to the best measure of Reform that could be obtained.

The House divided, on Lord Ebrington's Motion. Ayes 288; Noes 208—Majority 80.

Lord *Ebrington* said, considering that, under existing circumstances, it would be more consonant with his Majesty's feelings to have this Address presented to him with as little parade as possible, he begged to move "that the Address be presented to his Majesty by such Members of the House as were of his Majesty's most honourable Privy Council."

Sir *Charles Wetherell* begged to remind the noble Lord, that the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, the late Ministers, were of his Majesty's most honourable Privy Council; and having reminded the noble Lord of this, he begged to ask the noble Lord whether the object of his Motion was to insult the King, by sending the Address to his Majesty through his Majesty's late Ministers.

Lord *Althorp* said, that there could be no doubt that, in the Motion he had just made, his noble friend had departed from the ordinary usage of the House; which usage was, that addresses like this should be presented to the King, not by the members of the Privy Council, but by the whole House. It must, however, he thought, be clear to any man of ordinary sagacity, and of ordinary candour, that the object of his noble friend was, to consult his Majesty's feelings by having this Address presented in the most private way possible. He was quite sure, that the majority of the House would duly appreciate this considerate view of his noble friend; and he was equally sure that very few persons, indeed, either in that House or out of that House, would think that the hon. and learned Gentleman had displayed much loyalty in taunting and ridiculing his noble friend for being delicately scrupulous lest there should be even the appearance of wounding his Majesty's feelings.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, that the noble Lord had a right to his view of the subject, but he had also a right to his, which view he should certainly take the liberty of defending. [A general cry of "Spoke" prevented the hon. and learned Gentleman from proceeding.]

Sir *Richard Vyvyan* expressed his surprise that any intention should have been entertained of moving, that an Address, which involved the principle whether the other branch of the Legislature should be dictated to by the Minister, and which had only been carried by a majority of eighty, should be presented by the whole House. He would much rather that the Ministers would solicit a private audience from his Majesty, and present the Address themselves in private, than that the whole of the House should be guided on this occasion by merely a majority of eighty. He had never heard of such a thing before. Many Gentlemen had voted on the present occasion, after declaring that they only voted for the Reform Bill, and not for a change in the House of Lords; and yet, after all, the question had only been carried, in a House of 500 Members, by a majority of eighty. It was necessary that the nation at large should know this. The Ministers had been tried by a packed Jury; and they had also voted themselves in order to swell their own majority.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, that among the majority 100 persons might fairly be reckoned as being influenced by the expectation of being made Peers.

Sir *Robert Inglis* wished to express his concurrence in the Motion, and to do justice to the delicacy of the noble Lord which dictated it. He approved of it, and gave it his support.

Lord *Ebrington* said, that he would not be tempted, by anything which had fallen from Members on the other side of the House, to imitate that tone which, in the exercise of their discretion, they had thought proper to assume on the present occasion. He could not, however, help expressing his surprise at the ignorance of the hon. and learned Member opposite with respect to the practice of former Administrations, when questions like the present had been brought forward. If he had studied the history of Mr. Pitt's Administration, he would have known that that Minister and his colleagues always voted when questions like the present were brought under the consideration of the House.

Question carried, and the Address ordered to be presented to his Majesty by such Members of the House as were of his Majesty's Privy Council.

List of the AYES.

ENGLAND.

Althorp, Viscount
Anson, Sir G.
Anson, Hon. G.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Atherley, A.
Baillie, J. E.
Bainbridge, E. T.
Baring, Sir T.
Baring, F. T.
Barnett, C. J.
Bayntun, S. A.
Beaumont, T. W.
Benett, J.
Berkeley, Captain
Blake, Sir F.
Blamire, W.
Blount, E.
Blunt, Sir C.
Bouverie, Hon. P.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brougham, W.
Brougham, J.
Buller, J. W.
Bulwer, E. L.
Bulwer, H. L.
Bunbury, Sir H. F.
Burrell, Sir C.
Buxton, T. F.
Byng, Sir J.
Byng, G.
Byng, G. S.
Calcraft, G. H.
Calvert, C.
Calvert, N.
Campbell, J.
Carter, J. B.
Cavendish, Lord
Cavendish, Hon. Col.
Cavendish, Hon. C.
Chichester, J. P. B.
Clive, E. B.
Cockerell, Sir C.
Colborne, N. W. R.
Cradock, Colonel
Crampton, P. C.
Creevey, T.
Currie, J.
Davies, Col. T. H. H.
Denman, Sir T.
Duncombe, T. S.
Dundas, Hon. J. C.
Dundas, Hon. T.
Easthope, J.
Ebrington, Viscount
Ellice, E.
Ellis, W.
Etwall, R.
Evans, W.
Evans, Col.
Evans, W. B.
Ewart, W.
Fazakerley, J. N.
Ferguson, Gen. Sir R.
Fitzroy, Lord J.
Foley, Hon. T. H.
Foley, J. H. H.
Folkes, Sir W.
Fordwich, Lord
Fox, Lieut.-Col.
Franco, Sir R.
Glynne, Sir S.
Godson, R.
Gordon, R.
Graham, Rt. Hn. Sir J.
Grant, Rt. Hon. R.
Greene, T. G.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Guise, Sir B. W.
Handley, W. F.
Harcourt, G. V.
Harvey, D. W.
Hawkins, J. H.
Heneage, G. F.
Heywood, B.
Hobhouse, Sir J. C.
Hodges, T. L.
Hodgson, J.
Horne, Sir W.
Hoskins, K.
Howard, P. H.
Howick, Lord
Hudson, T.
Hughes, Colonel
Hughes, Ald. W. H.
Hume, J.
Ingilby, Sir W.
James, W.
Jerningham, Hon. H.
Johnstone, Sir J. B.
Jones, J.
Kemp, T. R.
Knight, R.
Knight, H. G.
Labouchere, H.
Langston, J. H.
Langton, Colonel G.
Lawley, F.
Lee, J. L.
Lefevre, C. S.
Leigh, T. C.
Lemon, Sir C.

Lennard, T. B.
Lennox, Lord A.
Lennox, Lord W.
Lester, B. L.
Littleton, E. J.
Loch, J.
Lumley, J. S.
Lushington, Dr. S.
Maberly, Col. W. L.
Macaulay T. B.
Macdonald, Sir J.
Mangles, J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Marryat, J.
Marshall, W.
Mayhew, W.
Milton, Viscount
Moreton, Hon. H.
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, J.
Mostyn, E. M. L.
Newark, Viscount
North, F.
Norton, C. F.
Nugent, Lord
Ord, W.
Owen, Sir J., Bart.
Paget, Sir C.
Paget, T.
Palmer, General C.
Palmer, C. F.
Palmerston, Viscount
Pelham, Hon. C. A.
Pendarvis, E. W. W.
Penleaze, J. S.
Penrhyn, E.
Peel, E.
Pepys, C. C.
Petit, L. H.
Petre, Hon. E.
Philips, Sir R. B.
Phillipps, C. M.
Phillips, G. R.
Ponsonby, Hon. J.
Portman, E. B.
Powell, Colonel
Poyntz, W. S.
Price, Sir R.
Protheroe, E.
Ramsbottom, J.
Ramsden, J. C.
Rickford, W.
Rider, T.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Robarts, A. W.
Robinson, Sir G.
Robinson, G. R.
Rooper, J. B.
Rumbold, C. E.
Russell, Lord J.
Russell, Sir R. G.
Russell, Lt.-Col.
Russell, C.
Sanford, E. A.
Schonswar, G.
Scott, Sir E. D., Bart.
Sebright, Sir J.
Smith, G. R.
Smith, Hon. R.
Smith, J.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, M. T.
Smith, R. V.
Spence, G.
Spencer, Hon. Capt.
Stanhope, Captain
Stanley, Lord
Stanley, Rt. Hn. E. G.
Stanley, E. J.
Stephenson, H. F.
Stewart, P. M.
Strickland, G.
Strutt, E.
Stuart, Lord D.
Stuart, Lord P. J.
Surrey, Earl of
Tavistock, Marquis
Tennyson, C.
Thicknesse, R.
Thompson, P. B.
Thompson, Ald.
Thomson, Rt. Hn. C.
Throckmorton, R.
Tomes, J.
Torrens, Col. R.
Townley, R. G.
Tracey, C. H.
Tynte, Charles K. K.
Tyrell, C.
Uxbridge, Earl of
Venables, Ald. W.
Vere, J. J. H.
Vernon, Hon. G. J.
Villiers, F.
Villiers, T. H.
Vincent, Sir F.
Waithman, R.
Walrond, B.
Warburton, H.
Warre, J. A.
Wason, R.
Watson, Hon. R.
Webb, Col. E.
Wellesley, Hn. W. T.
Weyland, Major
Whitmore, W.
Wilbraham, G.
Wilde, T.
Wilks, J.
Williams, Sir J.
Williams, J.
Williamson, Sir H.
Winnington, Sir T.
Wood, C.
Wood, J.
Wood, Ald.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wrottesley, Sir J.

IRELAND.

Acheson, Viscount
Belfast, Earl of
Bellew, Sir P.
Boyle, Lord
Boyle, Hon. J.
Brabazon, Viscount
Brown, J.
Browne, D.
Burke, Sir J.
Callaghan, D.
Clifford, Sir A.
Doyle, Sir J. M.
Duncannon, Viscount
Ferguson, Sir R.
French, A.
Hill, Lord A.
Hill, Lord George A.
Howard, R.
King, Hon. R.
Lamb, Hon. G.
Lambert, H.
Lambert, J. S.
Leader, N. P.
Macnamara, W.
Mullins, F.
O'Connell, D.
O'Ferrall, R. R.
Ossory, Earl of
Oxmantown, Lord
Ponsonby, Hon. G.
Power, R.
Rice, Right Hn. T. S.
Russell, J.
Ruthven, E. S.
Sheil, R. L.
Walker, C. A.
Wallace, T.
Westenra, Hon. H.
White, Colonel H.

SCOTLAND.

Adam, Admiral C.
Ferguson, R.
Fergusson, R. C.
Gillon, W. D.
Grant, Right Hon. C.
Haliburton, Hn. D. G.
Jeffrey, Right Hon. F.
Johnstone, A.
Johnstone, J.
Kennedy, T. F.
Loch, J.
Mackenzie, S.
M'Leod, R.
Morison, J.
Sinclair, G.
Stewart, Sir M. S.
Stewart, E.
Traill, G.

PAIRED OFF.

Bernal, R.
Biddulph, R. M.
Bouverie, Hon. D.
Burdett, Sir F.
Fitzgibbon, Hon. R.
Graham, Sir James
Newport, Sir J.
O'Connell, M.
Slaney, R. A.
Whitbread, W. H.
Wyse, T.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, May 11, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Lord KENYON, from the Counties of Flint and Denbigh,—against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland).—By Lord BELHAVEN, from Selkirk;—by the Earl of CAWDOR, from Banbury;—by Lord NAPIER, from Morpeth;—by Lord DURHAM, from Dumbarton;—by the Duke of HAMILTON, from Glasgow and Lanark; and by Earl GOWER, from Denny and Malton; with a great many others,—in favour of Reform.

REFORM—PETITIONS.] The Earl of *Camperdown* presented twenty Petitions from various places in Scotland, in favour of Reform, and in supporting their prayer he begged the attention of the House for a few moments. He was anxious to do so, in consequence of what had fallen from a noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Buccleugh) on a former evening, while presenting the petition from Edinburgh against Reform. Considering, that anything which fell from that noble Duke, with respect to Scotland, ought to be received with the greatest possible attention and consideration, he had heard him state with considerable regret that the feeling with respect to Reform was confined to only a certain class in that country, that it was only kept up by excitement, and that when that excitement ceased, the feeling in favour of Reform would pass away. He entirely differed from the noble Duke on that point. He was sure the noble Duke would not intentionally deceive the House by making such a statement, but the noble Duke was himself deceived; for it was certain that in no part of the United Kingdom was there such a determined, anxious, and decided desire for Reform as among the people of Scotland; it pervaded every class of the community, from the highest to the lowest, and was only opposed by those who possessed the monopoly of the elective franchise in that country. The mass of the people of Scotland were fully aware of the inestimable value resulting from the enjoyment of political rights; from the enjoyment of those rights they had been excluded, and he trusted they would not cease, firmly, but temperately, to assert the claim which they had to possess those rights until they were conceded to them. That this feeling existed, and that his representation of it was true, was to be found in the fact of the number of petitions which had been presented to their Lordships from Scotland in favour of this measure, and the petition which was agreed to in Edinburgh, must be conclusive on the subject. A more numerous, more respectable, more orderly, or better regulated meeting was never held; indeed, nothing coming near it was ever witnessed in Scotland for any public purpose whatever. As a Scotchman he was proud of that meeting—proud of the talents displayed at it—proud of the resolutions which emanated from, and were adopted by, that meeting—proud of the whole conduct of the persons assembled. The sentiments of that meeting were before their Lordships, and they were echoed in every one of the petitions which he would now lay upon their Lordships' Table. The petitioners wished him to state, that no reaction had taken place in Scotland on the subject of Reform; on the contrary, the desire and anxiety, as regarded that question, was greater and more intense than ever. They had further instructed him to pray on their behalf, that their Lordships would pass the Bill unmutilated and unaltered; and state, that the suspense in which the nation had been kept with respect to this measure, had been productive of the most disastrous consequences; and they looked forward to the healing measure of Reform as alone calculated to bring about a return of confidence in the country, and as the means of placing the institutions of the country on the firmest foundation. In these sentiments he perfectly and entirely concurred. England had now arrived at a crisis, with respect to this momentous question, when it was incumbent on every individual who had the welfare of his country at heart, to come forward and declare his opinion; for himself, he the more particularly felt a pride and pleasure in doing so, when that opinion was in unison with that of the large mass of the people of that part of the country with which he was more particularly connected; they considering, as he considered, that upon the passing of this Bill depended the stability, while, on the contrary, the rejection of it would be destructive of the best interests of the empire. The first petition which he had to present, was from the inhabitants of the city of Aberdeen, signed by 8,000 persons, and as upon a former occasion, when he had presented a petition from the same city, a noble Duke, whom he did not then see in his place, seemed to doubt the respectability of some of the persons who had signed it, he was anxious to call the attention of the House to the fact, that upon the present occasion, every person who had signed it had also attached his description to his signature. This petition, as indeed all the others he now offered to their Lordships, pointed out that, with respect to the 10*l.* franchise, they considered that clause the most essential and important part of the Bill; and the petitioners stated, that they had heard with surprise that some of their Lordships considered that the 10*l.* clause would throw the franchise into the hands of the lowest classes; and they stated that, although the city of Aberdeen contained 60,000 inhabitants, the 10*l.* clause would not extend the right of voting to above 1,000 persons.

The Duke of *Buccleugh* did not mean to object to any of the petitions referred to by the noble Earl being received by their Lordships. With respect to the observations which had fallen from him on a former occasion, he was not aware whether they were such as they were stated to have been by the noble Earl, as, not having had any intimation from the noble Earl that he intended to refer to the subject, he had had no opportunity of refreshing his recollection on this point. It certainly was the furthest from his intention to mislead the House. The statement he had made was on the authority of persons, on the correctness of whose opinions he could place the firmest reliance, and, therefore, he had felt himself called upon to assert it fairly and openly. Some discredit had been thrown on the

Edinburgh petition in favour of Reform, by the fact, that many of the persons who called, and who attended that meeting of the inhabitants of Edinburgh, were not themselves inhabitants of, or immediately connected with, that city. He would refer particularly to Sir John Dalrymple, who was convenor, as it was termed, in a different district, and who was at the present moment one of the Commissioners appointed by Government for determining the extent of the districts of boroughs and counties. There were also several other persons, no doubt, highly respectable; but they were persons who were not actually citizens of Edinburgh, but living in the neighbourhood. With regard to the number of persons who attended the meeting in the King's Park, including the procession of the trades, with their banners and music, he had stated, and he believed the fact, that it did not exceed 8,000. He had reason to know that very few of the workshops were left unoccupied on that day—that hardly a man left his work, and in one manufactory where 100 persons were employed, not one person was absent during the whole of the day. When the trades returned from the meeting, there was a crowd collected of about 15,000 persons on the North Bridge, opposite the Register-office, but they were attracted there by curiosity, and had not attended the meeting. He was aware that very great exertions had been made for getting up that meeting, and some extraordinary placards were stuck up in every part of the city, well calculated to mislead the lower orders of society. The placards were headed with the King's arms and initials, a circumstance which had very great weight with ignorant persons; and, as regarded the respectability of the meeting, he was informed that there was only one of the principal tradesmen of Edinburgh present at it. He was not aware that he had said, on the occasion alluded to by the noble Earl, that the feeling in favour of Reform was confined to certain classes; he, however, would now say, that he thought it was, and that there was a very strong feeling throughout the country against it.

The Earl of *Camperdown* could assure the noble Duke, that he was anxious he should be informed of his (the Earl of Camperdown's) intention to mention this subject, and he had endeavoured to communicate with him previous to the meeting of the House, but could not succeed. With respect to the statement of the noble Duke, that certain persons who assisted in calling and attending the meeting were not persons belonging to Edinburgh, not inhabitants of that city, he had heard that remark with some degree of surprise, because he very much doubted whether the petition which was agreed to at the meeting which was held by the conservative party in Edinburgh, and which petition, with 1,700 signatures, was presented by the noble Duke, and was described as the petition of the inhabitants of Edinburgh—whether more than half those persons were actually citizens of Edinburgh. With respect to his worthy relative, Sir John Dalrymple, if he was not a resident at Edinburgh, he at least had a very large property there, as he had also in its immediate neighbourhood; and, if he recollected rightly, the petition was described as being the petition of the inhabitants of Edinburgh and its vicinity. Now, as to the number of persons who attended that meeting; it was stated by those who were capable of forming a proper estimate, that it amounted nearer to 60,000 than to 40,000. That there was a number of persons assembled on the Calton Hill, and in other places, who were mere spectators, attracted by curiosity, he believed to be the fact. As a conclusive argument to prove the respectable character of the meeting, and the order and decorum which were preserved, he would merely state the fact, that not one single police charge resulted from that meeting.

The Earl of *Rosebery* did not wish to prolong this discussion, or to give rise to any party feeling on either side of the question. He wished to observe, however, that he had been informed, on the best authority, that the number of persons present at the meeting in question could not be less than 60,000; and, therefore, the information on which the noble Duke had made his statement could not be relied on. The noble Duke had said, on a former occasion, that the amount of property possessed by the 1,700 persons whose petition he presented, was 28,000,000*l.*: the noble Duke had not said pounds sterling, and he (the Earl of Rosebery) was, therefore, inclined to presume he meant pounds Scots. The number of 8,000, at which he fixed the meeting in favour of Reform, could not possibly be correct, which might be seen by referring to the public papers on either side of the question. He could not refrain from expressing the high sense which he entertained of the character of that meeting, and of the peaceable manner in which the persons who composed it conducted themselves. He had thought it necessary to say thus much, but was most anxious not to excite any angry feelings on the subject.

The Earl of *Haddington* had also heard the meeting estimated at 60,000, but others declared that there were not more than 700 persons present. There was no arguing upon such conflicting statements. He assured the noble Earl (Camperdown) that from his own actual knowledge he could undertake to say, it was an egregious mistake to state that every body in Scotland, except the monopolisers of the elective franchise, was in favour of the Reform Bill. There were many, and very respectable persons, who had no interest in the return of Members, and were yet apprehensive of the danger that would result from carrying the measure. They thought that, there must be some Reform, but their minds were not made up as to its amount.

The Earl of *Minto* said, that in no part of the kingdom did there exist a stronger feeling in favour of Reform, no where were the friends of the Bill more numerous than in Scotland. A voice was now arising on the subject, which would soon be distinctly heard, and which it would be impossible to mistake.

Petitions laid on the Table.

The Earl of *Rosebery* rose to present several Petitions from various parts of Scotland in favour of Reform, and asserted, that there could be no greater fallacy than to talk of reaction in Scotland. If any difference existed between the past and present feeling on the subject of Reform, it consisted in this, that the desire which was originally mixed up with some passion and excitement, had become more calm, more deep and determined, as the Scottish people perceived their right to a real Representation with greater force and clearness, and also saw the power which they possessed of attaining it. He congratulated their Lordships on having read the Reform Bill a second time —and hoped that there was nothing irregular on his part, as a Peer of Parliament, in expressing his concurrence in the sentiments of the petitioners whose petitions he had presented.

Earl *Grey* presented a Petition from the town of Cambridge, to which the signatures of 1,834 persons had been affixed in the course of two days, praying their Lordships to pass the Reform Bill without any alteration of the disfranchising schedules, or of the 10*l.* qualification, and without any alteration in any other part of the Bill that might be calculated to impair its efficiency and utility. The next petition which he had to present to their Lordships was, from the Merchants, Traders, and other Inhabitants of the town of Huddersfield, assembled in public meeting on Tuesday, the 8th of May, in consequence of hearing of the division in that House on the 7th. The petition prayed their Lordships to pass the Bill immediately, and though the petition was prepared and sent off at once on the receipt of the news, it was signed by 500 persons.

Petition laid on the Table.

The *Lord Chancellor* presented several Petitions from Scotland, in favour of the Reform Bill now on their Lordships' Table, and thanking their Lordships for having read that Bill a second time. He believed that there could be no doubt as to the respectability and intelligence of the petitioners. If he might venture to take this opportunity to make a suggestion to their Lordships, it would be, that if they did not wish to agitate the country—that if they really and sincerely desired that the excitement which now prevailed should not go further than it had done—they would, for the future, abstain from those remarks which had latterly too frequently fallen from some noble Lords as to petitions of this kind. He would defy the wit of man to devise a more effectual means of continuing the agitation which existed, and gathering together those immense assemblages of which they now heard in the present alarming crisis, than, as often as petitions were presented from public meetings, to take occasion to underrate the zeal of the persons attending such meetings—to represent that either curiosity had attracted them thither, or the desire of seeing the sights to be there seen, and of joining in the games incidental to such an occasion. An equally effectual means to produce such mischievous results was, to pronounce those immense assemblages, which were at present of frequent occurrence, as considerably overrated in their numbers, their amount, and their importance. While the attempt was thus made to underrate and depreciate the importance of those meetings, there might be exaggeration on the other side in describing the numbers assembled at them, and it might, therefore, be exaggeration to say that the late Edinburgh meeting was attended by 60,000 or 70,000 persons, but he had been informed by persons of military experience, and of habits which led them to calculate with much precision the numbers that would cover a certain space, tha there could not possibly have been so few as 40,000 persons at the late meeting in Edinburgh. Such was the information which he had received. He did not himself vouch for the fact, he only vouched for the respectability and the zeal of the persons assembled at the meeting in question, and for the habits of accuracy in matters of calculation possessed by those from whom he had derived his information. But it might be that they were wrong; it might be that there were not 40,000 or 50,000 persons at this meeting; it might be that the entire numbers of the whole meeting were so few as 8,000, but admitting that it might be so, he took it to be one of the barest and most remote possibilities that had ever been imagined, only to be exceeded by the still more absurd statement (for there was nothing so absurd that something still more absurd might not be found), that the whole meeting consisted of but 700 persons. Of this he was quite certain, that if their Lordships should continue to decry meetings of this description in this manner, and should endeavour to diminish their amount and importance by such statements—statements which they no doubt had received from individuals on whose accuracy they relied, but statements which they should know themselves to be well-founded before they made them—if their Lordships should continue to act in that way, they might depend upon it that they ran the risk of having a very alarming contradiction given to their representations. He had a petition now to present to their Lordships, which would prevent the possibility of any such statements being hazarded with regard to it, on account of the number of signatures attached to it. It was a petition from the town and neighbourhood of Sheffield. It could not be said that it had been adopted or signed by 700, or by 8,000 persons, though no doubt such assertions would have been made were not the signatures to the petition so numerous as to prevent the possibility of such a statement being for a moment hazarded. The petition, which was in favour of the Reform Bill, was signed by 29,200 persons. He would make no further comment on that petition, but let it speak for itself. He was one of those who did not wish to see such immense assemblages as had lately been witnessed in this country, but as long as such meetings continued to be held, he hoped that the business of them would be carried on, as the business of those hitherto held had been, peaceably, quietly, and without the slightest approach to disturbance of any kind. He was able to corroborate the statement of a noble friend opposite, as to the peaceable manner in which the great meeting at Edinburgh had been conducted, by mentioning the fact, that there was not, on the day on which it met, a single police case in the city of Edinburgh connected with that meeting. His hope, therefore, was, that if such meetings should continue to be holden, that they would be holden with the same moderation, quietness, and peace, that they had hitherto been carried on; and the most certain way to promote the holding of such meetings was, to endeavour to underrate the numbers assembled at them, and to describe those who congregated there as scarcely connected with the business of the meeting.

Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, May 11, 1832.

MINUTES.] Papers ordered. On the Motion of Mr. LAMB, of all Sums paid for Stamps by the respective Insurance Offices during the year 1831.—On the Motion of Mr. HUME, of the Amount of the Poor Rates, and Number of Persons rated, and who had Annually paid them in March last, in the Parishes of St. Peter and St. James's, Bristol.—On the Motion of Mr. JOHN WOOD, of the Salaries of the Judges of the Courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, with the Fees and Emoluments of their Clerks, and other Officers.

Bills. Read a third time; Uniformity of Process. First time; Insolvent Debtors (India); Juries (India); Insolvent Debtors (England) Act Amendment; Lunatic Commissions; Exchequer Court Offices.

Petitions presented. By Lord EBRINGTON, from Devonshire, for an Alteration of the Law relative to Weights and Measures; from Stockingtonhead, to Exempt Manure Carts from Paying Toll; from Devonshire, against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland).—By Mr. JOHN WOOD, from Bethnal-green, to place the Supplies in the hands of Commissioners till Reform was granted.

REFORM—RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS—PETITIONS.] Mr. *John Wood* rose for the purpose of presenting a Petition—the first, he believed, of thousands which that House would soon receive—praying, and in that prayer he heartily joined, believing, as he did, that it would speedily be re-echoed from every part of this free country, that they, the House of Commons, would refuse to vote any Supplies until the measure of Reform was carried. The petition came from the populous and important town of Manchester. He regretted that the hon. member for Thetford was not then in the House, because he wished to tell him, that this petition was agreed to at one of those meetings upon which the hon. Member last night endeavoured to throw so much obloquy. It was agreed to at Manchester, at one of those vulgar meetings of which so much was said in the debate of yesterday evening. Yesterday morning a copy of *The Courier* newspaper arrived at Manchester, containing an account of the resignation of Ministers. A meeting was instantly convened; it was most numerously attended; the petition which he held in his hand was prepared; and, in the space of three hours, it was signed by 25,000 persons; and of such importance was it considered, that that House should know that if there had been any re-action in the minds of the people, in that part of the country, upon the subject, it was a re-action in favour of Reform, that three gentlemen were immediately to proceed to London with the petition in a post-chaise and four horses; and in the space of seventeen hours afterwards the petition was placed in his hands. The gentlemen to whom it was intrusted wished to place it in the hands of one of the county Members; but, finding him first, they confided it to him; and he might justly say, that he considered it one of the highest honours that had ever been conferred upon him since he had been in Parliament. To the latest hour of his life, he should remain proud of the recollection that the petition of a meeting so respectable and so immense, had been confided to him for presentation to that House. As an Englishman he owed the greatest respect to the Kingly office. He owed not only respect, but more than respect, to his present Majesty, for the liberal course which he had hitherto pursued; but he thought he should best show that respect by endeavouring to exhibit to his Majesty the truth. By the events which had occurred within the last few days, it was pretty evident to the whole of the country, that the King had forsaken the advice of his trusty Counsellors—that he had delivered himself over to the subtle and backsliding party—that he had been entrapped in the meshes of some dirty intrigue, which, whether brought to perfection by man or woman, he cared not; but certain it was, that, in an evil hour, his Majesty had listened to pernicious advice. That being the case, he (Mr. Wood) claimed the privilege, as one of the people, of telling his Majesty, that he was much mistaken if, in these times, he thought to remain Chief Magistrate of Great Britain with the assistance, and acting upon the advice, of a boroughmongering faction. The King existed for the benefit of the people; if he delivered himself over, bound hand and foot, to a boroughmongering faction, the people would soon send that faction dispersed over the four quarters of the globe. If his information were correct, an attempt was making to form a Government which should set the people at defiance, or which would forfeit all claim to the confidence of the people, under a bond and pledge to pass the very Bill which the late Ministers were turned out for not passing. He begged leave to read the petition; which the hon. Member did as follows:—

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

"The Petition of the undersigned Inhabitants of Manchester, in the County Palatine of Lancaster, showeth;—

"That your Petitioners have heard, with feelings which it is impossible to describe, that the Reform Bill has again been virtually lost in the House of Lords, and that Earl Grey and his Administration have, in consequence, been compelled to withdraw from his Majesty's Councils.

"That your Petitioners, considering that the plan of Reform which has thus been defeated, was a measure which merely restored to the people a right to which they were always entitled by the Constitution, and of which they have been too long defrauded by a faction; considering, also, that the Bill had been twice passed by your honourable House, and was earnestly desired by the people, and, moreover, that it is a measure which, legally and honestly, can affect the people and their Representatives only, are at a loss to find words to express their indignation at being again denied their birth-right by the manœuvres of a small number of interested individuals.

"That your Petitioners, thus situated, have recourse to your honourable House, as the constitutional organ of their wishes, and their established defence against injustice and arbitrary rule; and do pray your honourable House, that you will assert your own collective dignity, and the indefeasible rights of your fellow-subjects, by a determined adherence to the Bill; and by refusing to vote any Supplies until a measure essential to the happiness of the people, and the safety of the Throne, shall be carried into a law.

"And your Petitioners will ever pray," &c.

The whole of the north of England, the Deputation from Manchester informed him, was in a state which it was impossible to describe. Dismay, and, above all, indignation, prevailed everywhere. He believed, however, if the House did its duty, that the country might yet be saved; if it would not, he believed the people knew their duty; and if the House would not stop the Supplies, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whoever he might be, would very soon find that his coffers were unreplenished. Whether such a line of conduct might be right or wrong, it was not for him to argue then; but it was his duty, as a Reformer, to state his firm conviction, that, if a boroughmongering faction should prevail, the people would take the most effectual mode of stopping the Supplies, by telling the tax-collector to call upon them when the Reform Bill had passed into a law. He had heard that one of the bold measures in contemplation was on an early day in the next week to dissolve the House, and to send its Members back to their constituents. How utterly ignorant and uninformed of the state of the country, of its feelings, its opinions, its determination—its unaltered and unchangeable determination—must those persons be, who, by boroughmongering cliques, by aristocratic domination, or through the medium of the non-disfranchised boroughs in schedules A and B, expected to return a House which should be subservient to the Minister of the Crown! If, however, the new Ministry, of whatever party, or of whatever materials it might happen to be formed, should think proper to dissolve the House, he believed it would deserve the thanks of the country; because he believed that the majority by which the Reform Bill had twice been carried through that House, would then be increased. Cordially concurring in the prayer of the petition, he begged leave to move that it be brought up.

Mr. *Heywood*, in seconding the Motion, bore testimony to the consternation and dismay which prevailed throughout the country, and expressed his conviction, that the passing of a measure of Reform could not, with any safety, be delayed.

Mr. *James* rose to express his cordial concurrence in the prayer of the petition. He, for one, would never vote for any Supply until the Reform Bill was carried—until the people were placed in full possession of their undoubted right—free Representation. "I have heard," said the hon. Member, "that the Duke of Wellington is again to be Prime Minister—that we are to have the fighting Duke and a military Government. But I have no fear on that head. If the soldiers forget themselves—if they are to take part with a violent faction [*expressions of impatience*]; I know, said the hon. Member, that the hon. Gentlemen of the boroughmongering faction around me do not agree with what I am now saying—I know that they do not like it—but I say, that if the soldiers forget their duty as citizens of this free country, and take part against the people—I know that swords, and cannons, and bayonets, and guns, and pistols, ay, and dungeons into the bargain, cannot compel this House to vote Supplies even for the support of that army. I know that swords and bayonets cannot prevent the people from permitting the law to take its course with respect to the payment of taxes. The people are not compelled to pay taxes in money. I know that swords and bayonets [*laughter*]; I say, that swords and bayonets [*reiterated laughter.*] Ay, undoubtedly, it affords very great amusement and entertainment to the boroughmongering Gentlemen, who, no doubt, would think it great fun to join the army and butcher the people [*cries of "Order."*] I know not what right those Gentlemen have to interrupt me."

Mr. *Wrangham*: I rise to order, and I submit it to the House, whether the hon. Gentleman, in his anxiety to preserve the tranquillity of the country, is following the course which a sense of what is due, both to the State and the public, would point out to him, when he charges those who differ from him in opinion with an anxiety to join the army for the purpose of butchering the people?

The *Speaker*: The point of order having been raised, all I can say is, that the hon. Gentleman, in the warmth and ardour of debate, and being excited by an irregularity of noise, by which the disorder of the debate was first commenced, has been betrayed into an expression which, in a moment of cooler reflection, he would not have made use of.

Mr. *James*: I am extremely obliged to you, Sir, for the very fair, just, and proper footing on which you have placed the irregularity of which I was guilty. I was, undoubtedly, betrayed into the expression of the warmth of my feelings at the interruption which I received. I was about to say that swords and bayonets [*laughter*]—I have no doubt but that the Duke of Wellington is about to be Prime Minister, and that the anticipation of a military Government is very entertaining to some of the Members of this House. They laugh at swords and bayonets; but the people are of a different opinion. Not that I wish the people to take up arms; God forbid. I hope they will not be driven to it. I hope they will not play the game of the Tories. They have a better remedy in their hands; all the swords and bayonets in the world cannot compel persons to buy goods distrained for taxes. If the people will only be true to themselves, I am sure they will find means of succeeding against the Duke of Wellington and all his armies; ay and that too without spilling one drop of blood.

Colonel *Evans* said, that he had just come from a meeting of 10,000 persons, whose character and respectability completely falsified the statement made by the hon. member for Thetford last night.

Mr. *Baring* rose, in order, as he said, to give the hon. and gallant Gentleman the opportunity of retracting the word falsify. If the hon. and gallant Member came from a meeting of 10,000 persons, and the hon. Member behind him (Mr. Wood) from a meeting of 25,000 persons, he did still hold it to be uncourteous and unjust for them to impute to him expressions which he never used.

Colonel *Evans* said, that he could not mention the fact of having been at one of those meetings without calling to mind the words of insult which he thought the hon. member for Thetford had last night applied to all assemblies of that kind. The words which he understood the hon. Member to use were these: that the Government had appealed for support to brawlers out of doors, or to the delegates of clubs and associations within. Was he mistaken when he supposed that the hon. Member used those words?

Mr. *Baring* said, that he could not answer for the particular words which he might have used in the heat of debate; but he had no hesitation in saying that whatever words he might have used, he had, at least, no intention to utter anything personally offensive either to the hon. Gentleman opposite (Colonel Evans), or to the hon. Gentleman behind him (Mr. Wood). The words that he used were, perhaps, stronger than he intended; but, at the same time, he thought that what the hon. Gentleman had stated was a misrepresentation of what had fallen from him. He did not mean to say—he did not even suppose that the hon. Gentleman had intentionally misrepresented him, but it seemed obvious that he had mistaken his meaning. He (Mr. Baring) certainly complained the more of what the hon. Gentleman had said, because he had taken an opportunity, last evening, of explaining the very expressions to which the hon. Member had alluded. The hon. member for Middlesex, in his speech last evening referred to those expressions, and he (Mr. Baring) then took the opportunity satisfactorily, as he hoped, of explaining them. He stated that he had not used them in the slightest degree in the sense imputed to him. He did not remember having used the words, but even if he had, he appealed to every Gentleman present whether, after having distinctly stated that he never meant them in the sense in which they had been received, it was fair or courteous that he should thus, on a second occasion have them attempted to be fastened upon him?

Colonel *Evans* begged to understand whether in his observations the hon. Gentleman had used the word "misrepresentation," and not "falsification."

Mr. *Baring* did not remember what particular word he had used, but, as he had before stated, he meant no personal insult to the hon. Member.

Colonel *Evans* said, that with that explanation he would pass the matter by. In allusion to one observation which had fallen from the hon. member for Carlisle, for whom, on many accounts, he entertained the highest esteem, he was about to observe that, as he could not help recollecting that one of the last intentions of the illustrious Duke, who had been referred to, was said to be the organization of a military force, to be brought into operation in the city of London, he sincerely trusted that such a measure would not be one of the first acts of the noble Duke's Government, if he should again come into power.

Mr. *Hume* wished to give the hon. member for Thetford the opportunity of saying whether he really did use the words which he (Mr. Hume) supposed he used last evening. The words that he (Mr. Hume) had put down at the time, and thought the hon. Member used were these—that "the Government had appealed to clubs and associations that were brawling without, and to the persons delegated from them within." Now, the offence to him (Mr. Hume) was, that he, belonging to one of those institutions, was supposed by the hon. Member to be delegated from a brawling association; and that was what he conceived the hon. Member had no right to apply to him or any other individual who sat in that House. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member would explain whether he was right in attributing those words to him, and if so, whether the hon. Member meant to apply them to him (Mr. Hume) or any other Member of that House?

Mr. *Baring* was really sorry to be called upon to trouble the House with so many repeated explanations. If on some occasions he ventured to address the House, it must be owned that he never did so with the ease of the hon. member for Middlesex, who was more in the habit of speaking. It was to him (Mr. Baring) a matter of labour and difficulty, and unpractised as he was, it might occasionally happen that words and phrases were used by him which, had he greater readiness or greater powers of selection, he would have avoided. On the present occasion, he hoped the House would see that, having used an expression which some hon. Members deemed to be offensive, he had been as ready as any hon. Gentleman could possibly be to explain it. He did not remember the application of the particular phrase which had been attributed to him. But what was the great subject which occupied the attention of the House and the nation? It was the Constitution of the country—the construction of a new system of popular Representation—a new adjustment of the balance of power between the three estates upon which the Constitution was founded. If that House must be so constituted as to be overawed by cries from without—if the action of public meetings was to be immediate upon the councils of Parliament, our mixed monarchical Government was at an end. If their discussions in that House were not free from all influence from without, it was a mere mockery for them to assemble; a far greater mockery to retain the appellation of an independent branch of the Legislature. He did not know that he had used the expressions attributed to him—but he was quite ready to repeat, that if they now expressed too much, only in apprehension of danger, they were likely to fall short of what would be the fact when they had their new Constitution. Whether that danger was apprehended with or without reason—whether those whom the hon. member for Preston had been pleased to call the boroughmongering faction, should indeed be scattered over the four quarters of the globe, as long as he (Mr. Baring) had the honour of a seat in that House, he would firmly and fearlessly speak his sentiments, without caring one straw by what public bodies, or by what public unions, whether of thousands, of tens of thousands, or of hundreds of thousands, these expressions might be disliked. Therefore, without recollecting the expressions which were attributed to him, without sufficiently remembering whether he had used them, he was now quite prepared to repeat them and to state it as his distinct opinion that that House would lose its freedom of debate as a Legislative Assembly, if it were to be overawed by the brawling, he did not mean the word in an offensive sense, although he must observe that the hon. Gentlemen who had objected to it had not been so very particular as to the phrases which they had within the last few days applied to the Crown—but he meant to say that, if the debates of that House were to be overawed by the proceedings of bodies without, it could no longer be considered as a free and independent co-estate of the realm. That was the danger which he apprehended, and if he wanted an example to prove what he meant to express, it was precisely contained in the petitions which had that night been presented, and in the arguments by which those petitions had been supported. Neither the hon. member for Middlesex, nor the hon. and gallant member for Rye, could have a more sincere desire and wish to promote the prosperity and happiness of all the honest labouring classes of the community, or a greater desire to contribute to their comfort and welfare, than the humble individual whom those hon. members had so unfortunately misunderstood.

Mr. *Hume* said, that as the hon. member for Thetford had stated he meant nothing personal in the observations he had made, it was of course sufficient, and he should say nothing further upon that subject. But with respect to the matter of the hon. Gentleman's speech, he must make one or two observations. He concurred entirely with the deputation who had come up to present that petition to the House, and with those who had deputed them, as to the necessity of the measure they pointed out. He was satisfied notwithstanding what the hon. Member had said of the excitement and alarm of the country, that the best wishes of the most sincere well-wishers of their country, who were more numerous than the hon. Member seemed to imagine, and who were quite as zealous as he was, were directed to the final success and triumph of the Reform Bill. He must say, that he thought the country was in imminent danger, and the peace of the country was likely to be interrupted most unnecessarily and most gratuitously. Those who really wished well to the King, and to the permanency of his Government, wished it to become permanent, not by the influence of military force, but by being the object of the affections and good wishes of the people. The petition from Birmingham had been agreed to at a meeting of 100,000 people, collected in a very short space of time, and was signed by 20,000 people in a very few hours. That was something of a sample of the deep interest taken in the success of the Reform Bill by the people of this country. The hon. Member had spoken of attacks being made on the Crown —none had been made; and he who spoke as the hon. Member had done, was in fact the worst enemy of the Crown. But, then, the opponents of the Bill said they were averse to it, out of a fear that it would prove injurious to the people. Why, almost all the despots that had lived had taken measures, or refused them, as they said, with a view to the benefit of the people. We had too long suffered from that hackneyed phrase to trust in it any longer. We must have, not professions, but performances, not talk about good Government but the thing itself. That was what the people wanted, and that was what they must have.

Mr. *Duncombe* also concurred in the sentiments contained in the petition. His object, in rising, however, was to put a question to the right hon. Baronet opposite, and when he did so he must remark that the observations of the hon. Gentleman opposite, as to the phrases used on his side of the House, were anything but founded on reason or justice. The hon. Gentleman complained of the attributes imputed to Members on the Ministerial side, but seemed to forget the epithets used on his own side. Did he not himself apply the epithet "Constitution-mongers" to hon. Members, and had not the House heard of such a phrase as a "mob-courting Attorney-General?"

Mr. *Baring* denied having used such a phrase, and even if he had done so the hon. Member was quite irregular in repeating at that time what had been stated on a former occasion

Mr. *Duncombe* only meant to remind the House that the use of uncourteous phrases was not by any means confined to one side of the House. The hon. Member designated his Majesty's late Ministers as Constitution-mongers and revolutionists.

Mr. *Baring* again rose to order, and appealed to the Chair, whether it was consistent with the rules of the House to refer to a discussion which had taken place at former periods.

The *Speaker* said, he was sure the hon. Member must be well aware, that it was out of order to refer to particular words in a former debate, and more particularly when these words referred to a different subject. These words were liable to misconstruction and mistake, and though the House did not always adhere technically to rules which had been adopted for the purpose of preventing irregularity, he must say, that it had never been the practice to persevere in quoting such detached parts of a former debate when they were objected to.

Mr. *Duncombe* bowed willingly to the authority of Mr. Speaker, for no one could entertain greater respect for that authority than he did. Perhaps the words of the hon. member for Thetford had not that force until they were in print which they would have from other persons. The hon. Gentleman had such an oily, silky way with him, that he forcibly reminded him of Bottom, the weaver, who was to play the Lion, but who said "he could roar like any sucking dove." He had originally risen to ask a question of the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir R. Peel), and he should make no apology to the right hon. Baronet for doing so, taking into consideration the great excitement that existed at present in the public mind. He had the highest respect for the right hon. Baronet, and should always wish to pay it to him. Precedents were great things in this country, whether they were good or bad, and the precedent he should make use of and follow was the question put on the 1st of June, 1812, by Mr. Stuart Wortley to Mr. Ponsonby, and he would repeat the very words:—"Whether any person, up to this morning, did make any proposition to the right hon. Gentleman, or to any of his right hon. friends, to form part of an Administration; and did the right hon. Gentleman or his friends give a refusal on personal grounds, or on what other grounds?" Secondly, "Whether, in what had passed in those propositions, if any were made, his friends insisted upon any, and what conditions?"[*] He was aware that objections had been made, and the right hon. Gentleman opposite, whose authority on these points was very great, had used these words:—"Mr. Wynn hoped also that the House would allow the answer to be given. In the last instance of the kind which had occurred, the House had so decided: that was during the Administration of Lord North."[†] Lord Castlereagh also had said, "That though, perhaps, the present was not a convenient time to put the questions, yet there could be no objection to the principle of them, as tending to explain the conduct and clear the characters of public men."[*] Upon this Mr. Ponsonby rose, and the right hon. Baronet should have the benefit of the answer given by that Gentleman, who said, "I trust it will occur to the House, that [Mr. Stuart Wortley having at Mr. Ponsonby's request, repeated the questions] after the questions put to me by the hon. Gentleman, it will be an unexampled hardship to deny me the opportunity of answering them as correctly, as fully, and at the same time as concisely, as possible."[†] Mr. Ponsonby gave his answer in these words:—"No person whatever, up to this morning, has made any proposal to me, or to any Gentleman whom I have the honour to call my friend, either in this House or in the other House of Parliament, to form part of an Administration, and, therefore, no refusal was given, or could be given, either on public or personal grounds."[‡] After quoting this precedent he should only state, that there were reports that this morning the right hon. Baronet opposite had accepted office upon the pledge of granting some kind of Parliamentary Reform. Upon these reports he should only repeat the question that Mr. Wortley had put upon the former occasion, and he trusted that the answer of the right hon. Baronet would be similar to that given by Mr. Ponsonby.

---

[*] Hansard, vol. xxiii. p. 314.

[†] Ibid. p. 315.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, he must beg leave, notwithstanding the precedents quoted by the hon. Gentleman opposite, to exercise his own discretion. He certainly was disposed to give the hon. Gentleman every possible information, both because it was proper for public men to give explanations of matters which might affect their character, and because of the courtesy which the hon. Gentleman had manifested to him in the way in which he put the question. He claimed the right of exercising his discretion, notwithstanding precedents; but, on the present occasion that discretion, would not induce him to refuse an answer. "I do not hesitate," said the right hon. Baronet, "to state, that I stand here in a private capacity only. I also do not hesitate to declare, that the rumour to which the hon. Gentleman has alluded, of my having accepted office under the Duke of Wellington, is wholly unfounded. The fact is, I have received no invitation, from any person authorized to make one, to accept office, and, therefore, stand here in my private capacity.' It was because he stood there in a private capacity that he begged leave to entreat the House to take care that, while it expressed its opinions on the great question which now occupied the public mind with firmness, to do so temperately. He felt that neither he nor any other Member had a right to dictate to any Gentleman the measure of vehemence with which he should give utterance to his feelings, but he also felt it to be a matter of duty to respectfully urge upon the House the expediency, indeed the imperative necessity, of not adding to the excitement of the public by violent expressions, or unnecessary reference to delicate and inflammable topics. It was the more necessary that they should abstain from such indiscreet allusions and exciting topics, as there was no man in that House authorized to address the House on the part of the Crown, so as to give an official contradiction to the vague assertions, or unfounded rumours, affecting the public mind, like that just referred to, and apparently credited, by the hon. member for Hertford; else why found a question upon it? It was by no means improbable, that many other rumours, equally groundless, and equally stimulant to the public mind, might be in circulation, which, however, it might not be so easy to expose: so that he trusted, in the absence of persons authorized by the Crown to speak officially, that hon. Members would exercise a wholesome discretion in bringing them in an authoritative manner before the public. For example, the hon. member for Carlisle had mentioned a rumour which no man could take it upon him to officially contradict, and which, repeated in Parliament without being contradicted, must necessarily aggravate the dangerously excited state of the public mind. That hon. Member, in alluding to a report, which might have no foundation whatever, that Parliament was to be dissolved on Monday by the Duke of Wellington's Government, made a most inflammatory appeal to the determination of the people, not to be diverted from their purpose by the "swords and bayonets", and other machinery of military rule, and which, he repeated, in the absence of those authorised to contradict or affirm the report, was only calculated to add to the excitement of those out of doors. Again, the hon. member for Rye had made it a charge against the Duke of Wellington, that the last act of his official career was marshalling a strong military force to act against the people in the city of London. He would calmly recall their attention to the facts of the case. The King was to have dined with the civic authorities of the city of London on the 9th of November. Great apprehensions were entertained that the occasion would be made instrumental in disturbing the public peace, and, accordingly, the necessary precautions were taken to protect the lives and properties of the inhabitants against all marauders. It was doubtless true, that in order to afford aid to the civil authorities, if the civil force should not be equal to the protection of the public peace, that he, as Home Secretary (and he, therefore, and not the Duke of Wellington, was responsible for the act) desired the Commander-in-chief to have a military force in readiness to aid the civil force in quelling disturbance, should it be necessary. And God forbid that the time should ever come when any Home Secretary would refuse, on a lawful occasion, to, at all hazards, call upon the military to assist the civil power in protecting the public peace. But what did they do on the occasion? Why, simply, when they found that there were serious apprehensions that the immense assembly which the occasion would collect might, at a period of the year in which the shortness of the days afforded great facilities to mischief and riot, be led into acts of collision—in the first instance, perhaps, with the police, and next with th military—they advised his Majesty not to attend the city dinner, as he had intended, and thereby precluded the possibility of the collision and its consequences. And for this humane policy they were at the time censured as unnecessary alarmists; while now the gallant Member, on the other hand, denounced them for having meditated something like military oppression.

---

[*] Hansard, vol. xxiii. p. 315.

[†] Ibid.

[‡] Ibid.

Mr. *Duncombe* was glad that he had given the right hon. Baronet the opportunity of contradicting the rumours he had heard. All these reports were extremely malicious, and he was glad they had been contradicted. He hoped that the right hon. Baronet—towards whom he entertained the most friendly feelings—would still preserve the esteem and respect of that House and of the country.

Lord *Althorp* was anxious to add his voice to that of the right hon. Baronet, in suggesting the wisdom of their being temperate, no less than firm, in the expression of their opinions, and in avoiding those vehement appeals, founded on popular rumours and insinuations, which were likely to excite the public mind unnecessarily. In saying this, he could not be mistaken for one who would impose any restraint on the freedom of debate. He felt the truth of what had been stated last night; namely, that that House should put itself forward as an example to the country. Feeling, as he and his colleagues must feel, that, till their successors were appointed, they were legally responsible for the preservation of the public peace, he would earnestly impress upon hon. Members the conviction, that temperate proceedings were the best means to the great end they had all in view, and that nothing was more to be deprecated by every honest friend of liberal principles than discussions calculated to unduly excite the whole people. He would be the last man to call upon the House to depart from the firm and decided expression and advocacy of those principles which they had hitherto supported, but he would remind them, that temperance and calmness were the best and most congenial allies they could enlist on the side of those principles, and those through agency of which they were most likely to be beneficial to the country. He wished also to impress it upon the mind of every man in the country who was a friend to Reform, that nothing could tend more to impede the great measure which they had so long been advancing towards completion than any ebullition of popular feeling at all involving a breach of the public peace. It was the duty of every honest Reformer to impress this important fact upon the minds of the people, and it was his urgent hope, that it would be acted upon, and that the people would seek for their rights firmly, but temperately, and by no means which the laws did not recognize as within their bounds.

Mr. *Warburton* thought the best course the people could pursue to attain their rights was, to vigilantly watch the proceedings of that House, and not to return any man who had voted against their interests, and to return every Representative who had honestly fulfilled his duty.

Mr. *Hunt* hailed the altered tone in which the people were spoken of in Parliament, as an omen favourable to popular rights. They were no longer the "rabble," or the "swinish multitude," but the "intelligent people" of this country.

Mr. *Gillon* observed, it had given him the most lively satisfaction to have heard the petition which had just been presented, as it clearly showed that Englishmen were worthy of that which they demanded—

their rights and liberties. As no Member from Scotland had yet expressed his opinion on this momentous crisis, he could not avoid saying and he was sure that in doing so he expressed the sentiments of nine-tenths of his countrymen—that the intelligence of the retirement of Ministers would be there heard with horror and dismay. He trusted in God the feeling would not proceed further; and he had great confidence in the good sense and discretion of his countrymen, as well as in their zeal and determination. At the same time he awaited with breathless anxiety the arrival of news from Scotland. The vote of this House last night would do much to tranquillize the public mind; they had shown that they were true to the trust reposed in them; and while they were true to the people, and the people were true to themselves, it was impossible but they must prevail. He was certain the example set so nobly by the city of London and the Reformers of Birmingham would be followed by the whole country; every great community and every village in the empire would send up petitions to this House, begging them to stop all Supplies till the Reform Bill was passed. And could he doubt that the Reformers in this House would do their duty? If they consented to vote supplies to an unreforming or wavering Government, they would forfeit all character for consistency—all claim on the confidence of their constituents. This was a resource left to this House and to the people by which they could at any time teach a lesson to haughty Lords and overpaid and treacherous Churchmen. Their late conduct would increase, if it were possible, the public detestation of the system by which they throve, and of the conduct they pursued. This, then, he declared (and he believed the resolution to be general), that until a bill, at least as extensive as the one lately before the House, should have become a law, he should not pay one farthing of taxes. A despotic Government, if such ventured to assume the reins of office, might imprison his person or distrain his goods, but they should not enslave his mind. If any man ventured to purchase these goods, a brand would be set on him like Cain, and he would be marked for execration and detestation by all the people. His countrymen, as had been well remarked by his hon. and learned friend the member for Kerry, had dearly purchased the invaluable blessing of freedom of conscience. Civil liberty was no less dearly valued by their descendants. Had the race degenerated—or had they forgot the glorious deeds of their ancestors? No; they hated civil despotism as much as their ancestors did priestly domination. He trusted they might not be driven to the same extremities to establish their freedom. The petition just presented should have his most cordial concurrence and support, now being the season for the people to speak out, and he trusted their voice would not be unattended to.

Mr. *Wynn Ellis* bore testimony to the earnest feelings entertained by the people of the great towns of the north of England on the subject of the Reform Bill.

Lord *William Lenox* said, that no individual in the House was more anxious than himself to see the Reform Bill pass into a law; but he called upon the people not to resist the payment of their taxes, or to act illegally. The moral strength of the country was for Reform, and Reform, efficient Reform, must be granted. He cared not who were in office, so that the Bill, unmutilated, passed, and pass it must, for what Government could exist unpledged to the measure? It was Tory delusion to suppose they could.

Mr. *O'Connell* supported the petition which had been presented from Manchester. His hon. friend supposed that the advice to stop the Supplies came too late; but that was not the case. The Irish Supplies had not yet been passed, and he would not allow one of them to be passed without a division, if the Reform Bill were to be thrown out. He thought that no Government would undertake to govern Ireland without it had money to pay the functionaries. He would not pass those Supplies without being likely to get the Reform, and the only chance he saw of getting Reform was to get a restoration of the late Government. He had attended a meeting this day, and he saw with regret the extreme degree of excitement that existed against a certain individual. When the hon. Baronet, who was as incapable as any man of saying anything intentionally severe upon those who were absent, and especially upon any one of the female sex, when he made an allusion to "secret influence," it was taken up in a way such as never could have been anticipated. They did not know the volcano they were standing on when they talked of having an Anti-reform Government. The people of England would not tolerate such a Government for a moment. He took that opportunity of saying, that he should present the Birmingham petition on Monday, and he should only observe now, that it was the proudest moment of his political life when that petition was intrusted to him, the native of a different part of the country, to be presented to the House of Commons.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* had been present at the Common-hall to-day, and could take it upon him to say, that the citizens of London regarded the retirement of Ministers, particularly in relation to its immediate cause, as an event likely to have the most deplorable consequences to the country. Till the Bill was passed, there could be no security for civil order.

Lord *Stanley* declared, that the sentiments expressed in the Manchester petition were participated in by the great majority of the people of Lancashire and the northern counties.

Mr. *Curteis* was anxious to take advantage of that earliest opportunity to state, that attendance in the country upon the illness of a near relative prevented his having heard of the resignation of Ministers till ten o'clock yesterday morning, when he immediately posted off to town, and travelled very fast with the hope that he might arrive in town early enough to give his vote in their favour. He exceedingly regretted that he was not present last night, for they should ever, cost him what it might, command his most cordial support, as he was confident they would of every honest Reformer and well-wisher of his country.

Mr. *O'Connor* also expressed deep regret that he was kept unavoidably away from the House.

Sir *Francis Burdett* had been present at a meeting that day at the Crown and Anchor, which was calculated to remove the doubts of the most sceptical Anti-Reformer. The people of this country were so intensely fixed upon having their favourite measure, that nothing short of madness could dream of longer withholding it. They felt, too—such was their well-deserved confidence in Lord Grey's Government—that to no other Administration could they look, with any rational confidence, for measures in harmony with the advancing intelligence and wants of the age; and they deeply lamented that bad counsels should have obtained a moment's sway over the mind of their hitherto popular Sovereign; and, above all, they called upon that House to redeem its pledges—more than once solemnly repeated—of supporting no Administration which was likely to defraud the nation of any portion of the great measure of Reform for which they and their children's children would owe a debt of gratitude to the honest and courageous Ministers who had staked their all on its success. He entirely agreed with them, and could not help hoping—when he recollected the native goodness of his Majesty's heart, which no person ventured to doubt, that, however mistaken, his Majesty acted from the purest intentions—that when the "lep'rous distilment," which had been poured into his royal ear by false-hearted counsellors, had worked its temporarily mischievous effect, and that he had recovered from the momentary weakness into which the poison had led him, his Majesty would see the wisdom and necessity of recalling his ill-judged declaration, and save his people from all the ills of civil convulsion, by acting upon the advice of his honest Ministers. But, be that as it might, the duty of that House was plain—the duty it owed to the country, to its own consistency, its own honour—namely, to support no Ministry not identical in principle with that of Earl Grey. If any man were insane enough to persuade himself nd his Sovereign that he could carry on a Government opposed to the present for a single week, let him make the trial, and that House would disabuse him in a single night. It was said the Duke of Wellington—the pledged foe to all Reform—was about to prove his own memorable declaration (one of the wisest in his political career) that "he should be mad to think of accepting office." Let him make the experiment. It would soon be seen, that though he might be as brave, he would be as senseless as his sword, to think, under the present circumstances of the country, with his peculiar views of its wants and interests, to undertake the management of its affairs. But there was hope for the country; it had returned a majority alive to its feelings and interests, and that majority would not betray their sacred trust; but would, with unflinching firmness, persist in forwarding that great measure of national regeneration, with less than which, the country could not, ought not, to be satisfied.

Mr. Alderman *Venables* gave his support to the petition. He thought that the loyal and industrious people had every claim to be relieved from the rotten boroughs.

Petition to be printed.

ANATOMICAL SCIENCE.] Mr. Warburton

moved the third reading of the Anatomy Bill.

Colonel *Sibthorp* always had opposed this Bill, and he always would oppose it, for many important reasons. The Bill consigned the bodies of those who died in the hospitals to dissection, which was decidedly a brutal act. The hon. member for Preston recommended the introduction of a clause for giving to dissection the bodies of all placemen and pensioners; but, whatever might be his hostility to those classes, he could not agree with the member for Preston in assigning their bodies to dissection.

Mr. *Fane* said, the three professed objects of this Bill were, to do away with Burking—to suppress the resurrection-men —and to afford a sufficient supply of dead bodies for the schools of anatomy. If there was any value in the system of registration proposed by this Bill, he would at once admit that it would be the means of preventing murder, and the plunder of the grave. But, on the other hand, if that system of registration did not prove efficient, the Bill would be a premium to murder, by enabling the murderer to escape with impunity. The responsibility resting on the hon. Member who had introduced this Bill was, therefore, immense. As to the supply of bodies, the main question was, what was the amount wanted? [Mr. *Warburton*: 1,200 in London.] That calculation would probably give 4,000 or 5,000 for the whole country. Until it was proved that this supply could not be procured without turning our hospitals into human shambles, he could never consent to such an arrangement, nor would the House be justified in perverting the stream of charity, under the name of science. He had no doubt that the voluntary supply would prove sufficient. There were those in great cities who did not scruple to barter the chastity of their daughters; and why, therefore, should it be supposed that there were none brutal enough to sell the bodies of their own children to the surgeon? "their poverty," if "not their will," would consent to such acts, and it would be much better for the Legislature to throw a veil over such transactions, so as not to disgust the mind of every man possessed of the common feelings of human nature. Every hon. Gentleman with whom he had ever conversed upon this matter, had shown that he entertained great aversion to this Bill; he, therefore, could not help regretting, that all those who concurred in this sentiment had not taken an opportunity of assembling in that House, when they might have got rid of a Bill which insulted the lower orders by pretending, that it was enacted for their benefit.

Mr. *Ruthven* considered that the making the sale of bodies legal was highly objectionable, even when a certificate was requisite, for the signature of a medical man or medical student might be easily obtained. The poor, whose benefit was to be the principal object of this Bill, might always have the best possible medical and surgical assistance at hospitals, and he was quite sure, that of late years the science had materially advanced under the existing laws, which nobody would attribute to the practice of Burking. This Bill held out a temptation to the poor and needy to traffic in the bodies of their friends or relations; and, as such, no civilized nation ought to suffer such a law. Ireland, which was now included in the operation of this Bill would be more influenced by it than England, and, though it had been asserted that the members of the medical profession in that country had requested that the Bill might be extended to Ireland, yet he knew that at a meeting of the Irish College of Surgeons, at which forty-eight members were present, it was unanimously resolved, that it would be inexpedient that this Bill should be extended to Ireland. In his opinion, this Bill, instead of mitigating, would increase materially the existing evils.

Sir *Robert Bateson* could not support this Bill, though most anxious to put a stop to the late atrocious practices, for he was confident that it would produce no such effect.

Lord *William Lennox* knew he could not prevent the third reading of this Bill, but meant to record, by his vote, his decided hostility to the measure. It had been carried through the House in a most disgraceful manner, there rarely being more than forty Members present during the discussions concerning it. He hoped that the Upper House would consider the feelings of the lower classes sufficiently to prevent this Bill passing into a law.

Mr. *Hume* thought nothing more unfair and unjust than some of the observations upon this Bill. He denied that it had for its object inflicting injury on the lower orders, and he much regretted that those who had said so had not had an opportunity of hearing the evidence given before the Select Committee on that subject. He, for one, felt much indebted to his hon. friend for the patience and perseverance with which he had conducted this measure through the House.

Mr. *Trevor* said, he would again vote against this Bill, which appeared to him to proceed on unfair principles, and to be an insult to the poor, whom it pretended to protect. It placed individuals who died in hospitals on a footing with murderers, for the bodies of both were to be given up to dissection. He wished the Bill had had a fairer consideration in that House, instead of being shamefully neglected. If he stood alone, he would still continue his opposition to that Bill.

Mr. *Rigby Wason* admitted that the lower orders were not meant to be injured by the Bill. He would, however, observe, that the Committee of which the hon. member for Middlesex spoke, had sat three years ago, and shortly afterwards, when the evidence then given was fresh in every body's mind, the hon. member for Bridport had introduced a bill different from the present. It was entitled: " An Act to prevent the unlawful disinterment of human bodies, and to regulate the Schools of Anatomy." This bill passed the House by an immense majority. The present Bill was entitled " A Bill to regulate the Schools of Anatomy," though there was not a word concerning them in any one of its clauses. It only attempted to regulate anatomical dissection at the private dwellings of surgeons. If the Bill should pass he should be sorry, for it would be a bad conclusion to the acts of an Administration which had otherwise done so much to earn the good wishes of the people. If the hon. Member had meant to benefit the rich and poor alike, why did he not adopt the amendment which went to allow, that the supply in the first instance should be gratuitous. If that had not proved sufficient to prevent Burking and exhumation, he (Mr. Rigby Wason) would have concurred with the hon. Member in going a step further, and making the sale of bodies legal. The hon. member for Stafford had stated, the other night, that this Bill was fit only for a country of cannibals. The Attorney General was in the House; and, in the most respectful manner, he would request him to tell that House, whether this Bill did not permit dead bodies to be bought and sold? That hon. and learned Gentleman's candour would never allow him to deny that it did. The hon. Member had not advanced a single argument to show, why bodies ought to be bought and sold—or what was the necessity of providing for further anatomical examination. And, indeed, how could he have done this, when there was his other Bill before the House, which confined anatomical examinations to public schools? He certainly should have liked to see a Bill for the purpose of putting an end to the crime of Burking; but he was afraid, as had too often been the case, that legislation on the subject came too late, and the crime had grown to such a height, that now hon. Gentlemen were willing to adopt any Bill, rather than allow the present system to continue.

Sir *Robert Inglis* felt very sorry that the amendments which he had thought it right to suggest had not been adopted. Though he concurred in the propriety of opposing the Bill, he knew that to divide the House would be utterly in vain. As a question had been asked of the Attorney General, he would also put two questions to him—first, whether or no it was lawful, at this moment, to be possessed of a dead body for the purpose of dissection?—and, secondly, whether, under this Bill, it would not be lawful so to be possessed of a dead body, having purchased the same?

The *Attorney General* would endeavour to give the best answer in his power, though he was afraid that it would not be very satisfactory; for, as it was a common-law question, the last decision formed the law on the subject. There could be no doubt that exhumation was a gross violation of public decency, and punishable as a misdemeanour. The last decision on this subject, which took place at Lancaster, before Mr. Baron Hullock, appeared to professional men to be a great extension of former precedents, and seemed startling and new. Some time ago the hon. and learned member for Huntingdon had entered into a very able argument, for the purpose of showing, that what was then laid down by Mr. Baron Hullock could not be law. He would here observe, that one of the evils which this Bill was to remedy, was the present uncertainty of the law on the question. He also hoped, that it would make it unnecessary to resort to the violation of the grave for the purpose of procuring subjects. As to the sale of bodies, he certainly believed that this Bill would legalize it. That, assuredly, was a thing which could not be contemplated without disgust, but it could not be remedied; it was an evil, too, that already existed; and, as far as the control of relations, and the medical care of surgeons were likely to be of any avail, the formality of a license, would to a certain extent, be beneficial. On the whole, this Bill was framed for the benefit of the poor. To them health and strength were of the greatest importance; they, too, were most subject to accidents, and they, therefore, wanted that skill of the surgeon which could only be attained by frequent examination of the dead subject. Another thing worthy of observation was, that Burking had always been confined to the poor: in fact, it was a crime that could not be practised on the rich, or those who had others interested in their welfare. If the hon. member for Bridport had seen any better remedy he would have been ready to adopt it; and it was only because he saw none better than this that, after the lapse of three years, he had brought forward the present measure. He believed that all, whether for or against the Bill, had laboured with the one desire of benefitting the poor; and, now that the Bill was on the eve of passing that House, they ought all to join in bidding God speed it, which he did most heartily, not only because he thought that it would prove advantageous, but also because, owing to circumstances more particularly connected with his own life, he felt peculiar interest on this subject.

Mr. *Sadler* differed altogether from the allegations brought forward by the supporters of this measure, as to the necessity of making a further provision of subjects for the anatomical schools. If the mortality in foreign hospitals (where the sale of the human body was legalized) were compared with the mortality in English hospitals, it would be found that the proportion had been much larger in the former. He was not quite aware that the subject would come before the House that evening, or he would have refreshed his memory on the subject: the deaths in the Paris hospitals were as one in six; while those in the London hospitals were not more than as one in twelve. In this country, public decency was respected; the sale of quarters of the human carcase, first to one and then to another, was not consonant either with the law of the land, or with the feelings of the people: and yet, so far from our anatomical science having suffered by this restriction, it was notorious that, in that respect, England stood unrivalled among the nations of Europe. The learned Attorney General had given his opinion on the law of the case; but, if he (Mr. Sadler) might be allowed to say so much, he could not help thinking, that the application to the learned Gentleman was ill-judged, when it was remembered that the name of Denman was connected with the highest anatomical knowledge, and that that great reputation was gained long before it was proposed thus to outrage the honourable and praiseworthy feelings of the people of England. In addition to what he had already stated, he would add, that, owing to there being no permanent provision for the poor in Paris, much slighter cases were taken to the hospitals there than to our hospitals; and in his opinion, enough had been said to show that the argument in favour of this Bill, on account of the necessity for a larger supply of subjects, was altogether fallacious. The great mass of the British public was alive to this subject, and they contemplated with extraordinary disgust any advancement in science that was to be made at their expense. The simple operations of anatomy—such as that of the amputation of a limb—required o peculiar degree of scientific knowledge; and it was those operations which were most frequently necessary in the case of the lower classes. With respect to those experiments which had more immediate reference to the vital and internal organs of man, it was true that scientific knowledge might be enlarged by frequent examinations in such cases; but much practical knowledge could not thereby be acquired which might operate in favour of human longevity. And even supposing that by this means some few hours could be added to the life of a man, was it worth while, for the sake of such an object, to outrage human feelings to an extent that would be scouted and decried in the most barbarous and savage communities? Even if this Bill should do any good, it would be at the expense of the morality, the decency, and the proper feelings of the living. If it were not pedantic, he could quote the highest authorities on this subject in favour of his opinion; but he preferred applying to the general sentiments of mankind for the broad basis of his argument. It was said, that this Bill was to prevent the crime of Burking; but the former measure of the hon. member for Bridport was brought forward before that crime was known, and, therefore, its principle could not in any way have reference to it. Besides, he sincerely believed that this Bill would do for Burking, what the late alteration as to game had done for the Game-laws; by facilitating the sale, the crime would be multiplied. With some modern theorists, their favourite scheme for doing away with adultery, was by making all women common; and so here, for the sake of doing away with Burking, a method was suggested for making murder easy and general. He was as much alive as any man to the interests of science. He wished to see all knowledge that tended to make life happy and comfortable, increase; but it could not be a just mode of advancing science, the first step of which was to be taken on the ruins of public decency. The great father of medicine made his discoveries—those discoveries which had left his successors little to do but to follow his footsteps—at that early period when his life would have been endangered had he been known to be in possession of a dead body;—why, therefore, if that great man was able to pursue his researches with such eminent benefit to mankind without any such public provision of dead bodies as this Bill proposed, should that be made legal which science did not demand, and which all good sense and right feeling repudiated? This Bill had not been unanimously adopted even by the medical profession; for the College of Surgeons of Ireland had petitioned against it—and he knew that the opinion of a professional man—who was held in the highest respect, not only in England but throughout Europe—was decidedly against it. He thought it a measure which would be productive of the most pernicious consequences to society, without being of any benefit whatever to medical science. Medical science had been constantly upon the advance in this country, and our medical men were now the most accomplished in their profession, and fully efficient to perform all those operations which the various ills and accidents of human life occasionally rendered necessary. He did justice to the enlightened benevolence of the hon. promoter of this Bill—long known as the encourager and friend of science; and he regretted that he could not agree with him in thinking, that this measure would be for the benefit of the people. But if the prejudice against dissection prevailed only amongst the lower orders of the people, why not let the provisions of this Bill fall more lightly upon them, by requiring the richer classes to contribute a larger proportion of bodies from among their own order, for the advancement of medical science. If his carcase was worth having, he was willing to give it up; but let them spare the poor from being made the sole objects and victims of this Bill. His wish had been, that the hon. Member would bring in a Bill to facilitate the introduction of dead bodies from countries where the prejudices mentioned did not prevail. Some gentlemen in the medical profession, with whom he was acquainted, had expressed a wish to that effect, and had given him a detail of the impediments they experienced on one occasion in landing twenty-eight dead bodies, although they had obtained them without difficulty in a neighbouring country; and though all other things were smuggled in with facility.

Mr. *Robinson* had no doubt that legislation was required upon this subject; but the question between the opponents of the Bill and the hon. Mover of it was, whether its provisions would accomplish what all parties acknowledged to be desirable. The medical men of the city he had the honour to represent, had intrusted him with a petition against the Bill, stating their anxiety for some legislative measure, but expressing their opinion, that the crime of Burking, under the public horror of which this Bill was introduced, would be facilitated by it. That crime had been a great deal adverted to in the course of these discussions; but his belief was, that in very few of the supposed cases of the crime had it really been perpetrated. The commission of such a crime must be conducted with the greatest secrecy, for the mere possession of a dead body by the class of persons likely to commit the crime was, of itself a sufficient ground of suspicion. But, if this Bill sanctioned the sale of dead bodies, the facilities for Burking would become incalculably increased. The hon. Member's whole argument went upon the assumption, that the temptation to the crime was increased by the high price of subjects, and that, if that were lowered, the crime would be diminished. But the question was, whether, after the passing of this Bill, the facilities for disposing of the body which it would afford, would not be sufficient to counterbalance whatever diminution might take place in the price of subjects. Philosophically speaking, a dead human body was like the earth to which we must all return, and he was ready to admit, that it was a prejudice to object to its dissection; but, when the universality of this prejudice was considered, and how closely it was connected with feelings which it was desirable to encourage, he must confess that he had no wish to disturb it. The hon. Member had said, that this Bill was for the benefit of the poor, but he could assure him, that the poor did not thank him for the care he took of them, and that the tendency of passing this Bill would be, to bring the House into disrepute. For all these reasons he would move that the Bill be read a third time this day six months.

Mr. *Warburton* said, as the arguments and assertions of the hon. Member had been so fully answered on former occasions, he did not feel himself called upon to say more than that he opposed the Amendment.

The House divided on the question that the word "now" stand part of the question. Ayes 42; Noes 4—Majority 38.

Bill read a third time.

On the question that the Bill do pass,

Mr. *Wason* said, some of the most respectable surgeons of the metropolis—and, in particular, one gentleman, who stood the highest in his profession—declared, that this Bill would so disgust the public with anatomical dissection, that its practice would be more difficult after the passing of this measure than at present. They thought that the clauses legalizing the sale of dead bodies would chiefly conduce to that effect. The hon. and learned member for Stafford declared, that if this Bill did legalize the sale of dead bodies, it was not fit for a Christian country—not fit for any country, or only for a country of cannibals. Since that, however, they had had the opinion of the legal adviser of the Crown, who had informed them, that this Bill really would legalize the sale of dead human bodies: by the Amendment he was about to propose, such sale would be prevented; and if, after the experience of a year or two, it should be found that there was not a sufficient gratuitous supply, a bill to amend this could be brought in, and he should then be among the first to support such a proposition. The only argument that could be urged against his Amendment was, that the number of bodies which could be furnished would not be sufficient for the purposes of the due encouragement and extension of the science of anatomy; but he did not see what weight could be given to that argument, when the number of unclaimed dead bodies annually produced by two parishes of the metropolis was found to be no less than 1,100. The effect of his Amendment would be, to equalize the operation of the Bill between the richer and poorer classes. If this Bill enacted that dead bodies might be bought and sold, it could not be imagined that the rich would sell their bodies, or those of their relatives. Why, then, cast a stigma upon anatomy, by rendering bodies the subject of sale? Individuals might really wish to give up their bodies, or those of their relatives, to the purposes of science; but would they do so if the parties were placed under the imputation of so acting for the sake of a paltry bribe? The only argument urged, on a former occasion, against a similar proposal to that he was about to make was, that an amendment of the kind was hypocritical; for, if it were enacted that bodies should be given away, sales would, in fact, still take place. But were they, from a love of science and philosophy, to pass a bad law, because, forsooth, a good law would be evaded? No law could ever be passed which might not be evaded; but, if this were evaded, let the transgressors be punished, as in any other case. He did not mean to propose a precise penalty for the breach of this particular clause, but would leave the question of punishment to be decided by the general clause at the end of the Bill. The hon. Member concluded by moving the insertion of words to prevent any fee or reward being given or received for permission to use bodies for dissection.

Mr. *Hunt* rose for the purpose of seconding the motion of the hon. Member near him, for it would be a cannibal bill if it legalized the sale of human bodies. The Attorney General had assured the House that it did, and there was no doubt that this was the very object of the Bill. If this was legislating for the poor, they would not thank the hon. member for Bridport for his law. The system of selling dead bodies was inconsistent with English feeling, with the Christian religion, and if Christian burial was done away with, there would soon be an end to Christianity. He hoped the Bishops in the House of Lords would strenuously oppose this Bill. They had brought discredit upon themselves by their conduct on the Reform Bill, and they now had an opportunity to retrieve their lost popularity, by opposing this obnoxious Bill.

The House divided on the Amendment. Ayes 5; Noes 43; Majority 3 .

Bill passed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, May 14, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Earl GREY, from Dartmouth, Clifton, Burnbisland, and Hardness;—by Lord DINORBEN, from Ilfracombe;—by the Earl of CAMPERDOWN, from Kilsith, and Dunse;—by the Duke of GRAFTON, from Bury St. Edmund's;—by the Marquis of WESTMINSTER, from Frodsham;—by Lord DURHAM, from

Cupar;—by Lord **Holland**, from the Dissenting Ministers of London and Westminster, and from Stratford-upon-Avon; from the Dissenting Ministers of the County of Worcester; and from Heatherfield and Honiton,—in favour of Reform.—By the Earl of **Roden**, from Drumgooland;—by Lord **Carbery**, from various Places in Ireland;—by the Earl of **Chichester**, from Brighton; and by the Archbishop of **Armagh**, from six Places in Ireland,—against Reform.—By the Earl of **Roden**, from Stirling,—against the Grant to Maynooth College.

The New Ministry.] The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, that, as he understood, a new Administration was forming, but not yet completed, he considered it his duty to move, that the Order of the Day for their Lordships going into Committee on the Reform Bill be discharged, with the view that the House should go into Committee on that measure on Thursday next.—Ordered.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, *May* 14, 1832

Minutes.] New Writ ordered. On the Motion of Mr. **Throgmorton**, for Berkshire, in the room of Mr. **Dundas**, created a Peer.

Bills. Read a second time:—Juries, and Insolvent Debtors (India.)

Petitions presented. By Mr. **Ruthven**, from Seapatrick, for the Abolition of Tithes (Ireland); and from Naas, St. Andrews, and Grey Abbey, against Police Interference.

London Petition—Change of Ministry.] Mr. Alderman *Wood* presented a Petition from the City of London, agreed to at a meeting of the Livery in Common Hall assembled. He wondered whether the hon. member for Thetford, if he was in the House, would say that this was a foolish petition; but perhaps he would, for he had asserted the same thing of the petition of the Court of Common Council, who were not usually accustomed to send up foolish petitions to that House, or to any other body. Some of the gentlemen who had voted this petition, though not quite so rich as the hon. member for Thetford, were possessed of property, varying from 100,000*l.* to one million. That circumstance alone, he admitted, would not prevent them from sending up a foolish petition; they were, perhaps, quite as likely to do it as men of less property; but he did not think they had done so in the present instance. They had carefully considered the petition they had agreed to, and they felt strongly the same desire with the country at large, that the Reform Bill introduced by the late Ministry should be passed, as requisite to give public satisfaction, and ensure public content; though the effect of that Bill would be, to limit the franchise possessed by some of the petitioners, as Liverymen of London, still they were ready to sacrifice that private and personal advantage, in order to obtain a measure which they thought would be beneficial to the country at large. The petitioners prayed the House to refuse any further Supplies to the Executive, till the Reform Bill was passed into a law—and with that prayer he most fully concurred. He could only say for himself, that he agreed with every word of the petition, and that he should certainly vote against all Supplies till the Reform Bill had become law.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* wished to say a few words upon this petition: it was one which had been passed at a full meeting of the Livery, in Common Hall assembled, and was, therefore, entitled to every consideration. He was convinced it was impossible for any Government to carry on the affairs of the country unless they adopted the principles of the Reform Bill; because, there was a vast majority of every class of the people who were in favour of it, and were most anxious that its enactments should become law. He should say but a very few words on the other part of the prayer of the petition, namely, with respect to the stopping of the Supplies. It was, undoubtedly, within the power of the House of Commons to refuse the Supplies, but it was a power that ought to be exercised with the greatest care and caution; as, whenever such a circumstance took place, it must disarrange all the transactions of commercial life, and be productive of the most dreadful consequences—of such consequences as it was the object of the Reform Bill to avert. Whenever circumstances arose that were supposed to call for resorting to such a measure, he should endeavour to act with all the discretion that it was possible could be used under the particular circumstances of the case; but he trusted it never would arise. With the other part of the petition he most cordially concurred.

Lord *Ebrington* said, Sir — Upon the subject to which this petition relates I have a few words to address to the House—I allude to the reports which have this morning gained general publicity, and which have produced a degree of general excitement superior to any that we have yet seen connected with the passing of the Reform Bill, and which, I think I may add, have also excited general consternation. I allude to the reports that his Grace, the Duke of Wellington has received his Majesty's commands to form an Administration; and if there be here any gentleman who has information that can satisfy the House of Commons upon this matter, I implore him to give us that information. It, as every gentleman well knows, is further said, that the Duke of Wellington has accepted office, on condition of bringing in the Reform Bill—I was going to say—but of carrying on the Reform Bill—that Bill, the heads of which were propounded by Lord Ellenborough, after the vote of the other House, which led to the retirement of the late Administration. Now, Sir, I stated on a former occasion that it was not my wish to throw any unnecessary embarrassments in the way of forming a Ministry; and I can truly declare, that, if the materials could be found from any parties in this country, whereby the Crown could form a Government that should not involve a departure from every principle that has been expressed by them throughout the discussions upon this question, though I should not have had that confidence in such a Government that I should desire to have in any Government that undertook to carry the Reform Bill; yet, if such a Government was formed on the principle of carrying the Reform Bill, I for one would not withhold from it my humble support. But I must say, that it is impossible for me to give any support to any Government that, under present circumstances, could be formed by the Duke of Wellington, because there is no pledge that he could give of his intentions in favour of a measure of Reform which can be stronger than those which stand recorded by repeated votes—by speeches—and by solemn protests—of an uncompromising hostility to that measure. Is it possible, Sir, that the Duke of Wellington can come down to the House of Lords with that Bill in one hand, and with his Protest in the other, and call upon the House of Peers to pass that measure, or to pass anything amounting to any portion of that measure, that can give the slightest satisfaction to this House or the people? Is it possible, too, for any of those noble Lords, who signed that Protest, to become his associates? Is it possible, especially, that he who denounced the vengeance of Heaven on the principles of this Bill, that he can come round to support this Bill, or any bill that is founded on the same principle? I hope—though I do not know him—that he is not capable of adopting such a course. I hope, if political principle still continues to have any sway whatever over men—if anything like public morality still exists—that neither in this nor in the other House of Parliament will one Gentleman be found, who denounced this measure as nothing less than spoliation and robbery, to support it, merely because it is proposed under a new Administration; that none will be found who, at the bidding of any one man, can thus turn their backs on all that they have before so solemnly asserted. If, however, that should be the case, I shall console myself with feeling that the course which I have pursued—and which my hon. friends around me have pursued—has been far different, and that, though others may desert their principles, we have never betrayed ours. If the Bill, as propounded by Lord Ellenborough, should be brought into the House of Peers, and, after being carried there, should come down to this House, to that Bill, unless, in the interval, he should again change his mind, and depart from the principle of the Bill, to that bill, so far as it effects a disfranchisement of corrupt boroughs, at least as extensive as schedule A, so far, too, as it effects the enfranchisement of the large towns, and adopts the 10*l.* qualification, I shall give, and I have no doubt that my friends around me will do the same, my cordial and zealous support. However others may change, the principles of our action will still continue to be the same. But I must here be permitted to say, that, when the Reform Bill was proposed, it was well known that I gave up my opinion upon some further measures of Reform which I had before supported, on the condition of gaining for the country all that was proposed by that Bill. To gain that much at the least, we are all equally anxious now, and should anything short of that be proposed to us, though we should be ready to take that, yet I trust that we should, in that case, never rest satisfied till we had gained the full extent of our former demands. But it is in vain to hope that the satisfaction which would be derived to the country from the passing of this Bill, when received from the hands of the old and tried friends of Reform, will be equalled by the satisfaction with which they will receive it when passed by the other party. What, Sir, will be the reflections of the country upon this extraordinary change, if indeed, it is possible to think such a change has taken place, for, till I hear of that change in a manner that leaves not the possibility of doubt, I shall not yield it my belief, in however various shapes it may appear? What is the consequence, I ask, that will be produced by such a change? I know not; but I trust that, whatever may happen, the people of the whole country will have the opportunity of expressing their opinions firmly and decidedly, but, at the same time, I hope that they will express them moderately and temperately—that they will bear in mind that the worst blow that can be given to the Reform Bill, the greatest injury that can be inflicted on the cause of Reform, would be the consequence of any attempt to carry the measure by any means but those which are strictly constitutional. I beg to apologize to the House for the length at which I have troubled them; and again I implore any Gentleman who may be acquainted with the matter, to satisfy us on the point to which I have alluded.

Sir *Henry Hardinge*: I should be the last person to intrude myself upon the notice of the House, if I thought I should be injuring the interests of the Duke of Wellington; but I stand here in that situation that enables me, without impropriety, to make a few observations in answer to the noble Lord. I have received no proposal from his Majesty to take office, and therefore, when the Duke of Wellington is spoken of as guilty of a want of public morality, I, as a friend of the Duke of Wellington, feel called upon to state, that there is no act of his life that justifies any hon. Member in applying to him that imputation. The use of such terms and such expressions has alone caused me, humble as I am, to rise and protest against them, not in anger or irritation, but because I think they are not justified. If his Majesty, in consequence of the advice tendered to him by his late Ministers, is in that predicament that he has been obliged to call on the Duke of Wellington for advice, I am persuaded that the conduct of the Duke of Wellington will be, as it always has been, that of a loyal and devoted subject. With regard to any consistency or inconsistency on the part of the Duke of Wellington, I am aware that he has expressed in strong terms his opposition to the Bill, and that he has entered a protest against it. I have myself, in this House, used expressions equally strong in declaring my opinion of the dangerous consequences of that revolutionary measure: I still retain those sentiments, I think that the Bill is a dangerous and revolutionary measure, and that it will be so if only a little mitigated, while its essential qualities are retained. And while enfranchisement and disfranchisement, and an enlargement of the constituency form its basis—if such a Bill be brought down to this House, with those essential requisites which this House and the country expect, it is not for me to state who will bring down that bill, or whether it will be passed through the House of Lords by the Duke of Wellington, for of that I am ignorant. I know nothing of such a proceeding being about to take place. I say I have not accepted office from his Majesty—I am not aware of the details which are going forward; but when I hear the noble Lord opposite state what he has stated, I cannot remain silent, but must be allowed to assert, that the Duke of Wellington is incapable of doing anything, in private or public, that can subject him to the charge of being guilty of an act of public immorality.

Lord *Milton*: The House, Sir, must have heard with great satisfaction, from the gallant Officer opposite, that the Duke of Wellington is incapable of an act of public immorality; because, the gallant Officer is a person who, more than any other individual, is capable of forming an opinion of the conduct which the noble Duke will most probably pursue; but he has made some little mistake in the answer he has given to the observations of my noble friend, for he has assumed that my noble friend has accused the Duke of Wellington of an act of public immorality. He did no such thing. What he stated was, that if the Duke of Wellington, having been the author of that Protest which has found its way upon the Journals of the House of Lords, is, at the same time, the author of a bill which he has already described as revolutionary, and which the gallant General still describes as revolutionary; if, I say, the Duke of Wellington, having been the author of that Protest, has formed an Administration on the principle of passing that bill, then the Duke of Wellington has been guilty of an act of public immorality. On the question put by my noble friend, as connected with the subject of this petition, the gallant Officer has given no answer. I trust, however, that before the observations which have arisen on this petition shall have passed away, that some other person, who, though not equally in the confidence of the Duke of Wellington with the gallant Officer, will yet be able to make some communication to this House which shall satisfy the public, that the imputation on the conduct of the Duke of Wellington will never be deserved, and that, if his Grace does accept office, he will do it untainted with such conduct, which, if adopted, would most certainly be an act of public immorality. The gallant Officer says, that the conduct of the Duke of Wellington will be that of a loyal and devoted subject. I hope by that expression that he means nothing but that his Grace will show loyalty and devotion to the interests of the country, and not to the caprice of any man. If the gallant Officer means by that that there stands in these realms any human being before whom loyalty and devotion could call on any man to sacrifice his frequently-declared and solemnly-recorded opinions, the gallant Officer must entertain an opinion inconsistent with the safety and well-being of the country—an opinion that will put an end to the responsibility of Ministers, and, by so doing, will endanger the monarchy itself, which it has always been the policy of the Constitution to guard, by relieving the Chief Magistrate from all responsibility, and throwing that responsibility on the Ministers. I am sure, Sir, that it could not be the gallant Officer's meaning, when he used those words, that devotion and loyalty were compatible with a dereliction of principles, so distinctly, frequently, and solemnly recorded, or that true devotion and loyalty could exist in connection with that conduct which my noble friend has described; and which, if the Duke of Wellington were guilty of it, would justly render him liable to the accusation of having acted inconsistently with public morality.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* was understood to say, that the inference drawn by the noble Lord was unfair, and that he should not have risen but for the observation of the noble member for Devonshire.

Mr. *Baring* said, it is not to be denied that the country stands, at present, on the brink of a great crisis, but I rise simply to call the calm attention of the House (if, at such a time, and on such a subject, it can give me its calm attention) to the position in which we are placed. I do not attribute to hon. Members their eagerness or anxiety as a fault, but in proportion to the importance of the topics which engage us, is the necessity of giving a calm consideration to the circumstances in which we are placed. I say this, too, notwithstanding the sneer of the hon. Gentleman opposite; and the question really is, whether we have been brought into our present position by the fault of his Majesty, or of the Ministers? In, perhaps, more constitutional language, I may inquire, if what has occurred has been produced by the King's fault, or by the fault of some phantom adviser who has operated upon the Royal mind? All I wish is, that hon. Gentlemen should consider whether it is generous towards the Crown, whether it is common fairness towards the Crown, to irritate the public mind, from one end of the kingdom to the other, before the Crown is in a condition to make an answer? Although I venture to address the House on behalf of the Crown, I beg to say, that I am not empowered by the Crown. I have not had the honour to meet his Majesty; but I am entitled, like others, to state what I think is due from a mere sense of justice. The good sense of Ministers has, it is true, led them to abstain from any reflections; but I put it to their more immediate friends—the two noble Lords, for instance, who have addressed the House, whether it is not consistent with honour, good faith, and common decency, to wait, at least, until the King has the means of being constitutionally heard, before he is bandied from one end of the kingdom to the other, as a faithless person? The King was put forward as the advocate of a great measure, which was received with extreme favour by the great mass of the people; and now it is asserted that he has turned round to disappoint them. I do not say that this has been imputed by the two noble Lords, but that language has been held at public meetings [*cheers, laughter, and cries of "no!"*]. I trust hon. Gentlemen will give me leave to speak; and if they will so far conform to the rules of debate, I shall be most happy to listen to them in return. I assert that no person can have read all the libels that have been published, from one end of the kingdom to another without seeing that such is the sum and substance of the accusation against the Crown. It was very properly stated by the hon. member for Preston, the other night, that although here and elsewhere there may be a great many persons anxious about the state of parties and individuals, the question with the country is, what is to become of the great measure of Reform? At least it is for the country to wait, and I hope it will wait without being agitated and excited by any observations, but especially by such as are made here. The country will be disposed to wait to see whether, in fact, the King has so broken faith, because, I admit, whatever may be the opinions of others, or of the humble individual now addressing the House, that the Crown has, undoubtedly, given a pledge to the country of an extensive measure of Reform, and no person could approach his Majesty with the advice, by forfeiting that pledge, to sacrifice his own character, and to sacrifice the monarchy. I repeat, that no man could advise the King deliberately to break his presumed faith with his people. No man could approach the Throne, under existing circumstances, with any other than this language:—"My own opinion is, that the Reform Bill will not promote the good of the country: the Constitution to arise out of it will not be so beneficial as that we are about to abandon; but dangers may arise—an emergency may occur—circumstances may present themselves requiring this concession." After what has proceeded from the Crown, no persons, whatever might be their private views, could give advice different from that, and the case must be governed by the peculiar difficulties attending it. I know not what the sentiments of the Monarch may be, but only such advice could for a moment be listened to: the determination once taken to grant Reform—the pledge for that purpose once given, it must be substantially redeemed and made good. At the same time, let not the House suppose that I am implicating any other, or that I am detailing anything that actually passed between his Majesty and others—I speak merely my own opinion—I have no right to speak for others; and the Duke of Wellington is perfectly competent to explain and justify his own conduct. With my right hon. and gallant friend near me (Sir Henry Hardinge), I am confident that the great mass of the people will feel that, after the great services of that distinguished individual, it is not upon light grounds that confidence ought to be refused. Such being the case, I come to the question—Has this Ministry been broken up because the King has turned short round, and refused to make the Reform Bill law? I deny it. The situation is, undoubtedly, very serious and lamentable, but the Crown must be advised in some way by somebody. The Ministers retire—they refuse to perform their duties—and I admit, that to recommend the King not to pass a Reform Bill would be advice of a most pernicious kind, and the individual who gave it would be justly exposed to the reprobation both of the House and of the country. As far as I can understand (and my information is little beyond that of any other hon. Member, being mainly derived from what the noble Lord had said on a former occasion), the Administration was broken up on this simple ground—that the King had to deal, not only with the House of Commons but with the House of Lords; and in reference to the latter, he was required to establish a most dangerous and atrocious principle—that principle being, that every time the two Houses of Parliament differ on a question of legislation, the Minister of the Crown is entitled to force the House of Lords, by sending an immense number of Peers into it: on the refusal of the King to accede to this plan, the Ministers throw up their commissions in his face, and the country is to be told, because his Majesty has conscientious scruples in so dealing with a branch of the Legislature, that he is false and perfidious. As far as my information goes, that is a fair view of the case: but I do not pretend even to say, that my intelligence is correct, and still less do I call upon the House to pronounce any opinion. All this House and the country are expected to do is, to wait until the Crown is in a condition to tell its own story—to allow that justice to the King which every criminal has a right to when placed at the bar for trial. Whatever may be the feelings of the House, or whatever may be the popularity of the question out of doors, I think that the good sense of the country will revolt against any other mode of dealing with its Sovereign. Angry speeches and angry proceedings are at least ill-timed, until the Crown has the means of stating its own case. I have no intention of going further into the subject; I merely state what is my impression, and I have no wish to enter into the particular merits of this or of any other Reform Bill; but this I will say, in reference to the charge of immorality so freely dealt out, that, although I have voted and spoken against the general principle of the Bill, and although I still maintain those opinions, yet I have had no sinister purpose to serve. I have done now, and I did, as the hon. member for Midhurst and others may remember, at a public meeting at the London Tavern, state, that, however objectionable the Bill was, there was such a feeling in the country in favour of it, that there would be no permanent peace until the measure was conceded. I used that expression twelve months ago—not in a corner, but at a public meeting—and of course without reference to what has now occurred. I have mentioned it, in order to show, that a man may be perfectly justified in adopting a measure he does not approve, for the purpose of averting dangers of a worse and more threatening description. This may be called public immorality; but I admit that I was guilty of it, and at a public meeting twelve months ago. Whether this may also be the opinion of the Duke of Wellington I know not, and I have no authority to state; but when it is imputed as an act of immorality, I feel bound to take my share of it; and, for one, I contend that, instead of being immoral, it is an honest and defensible proceeding. I repeat, that we ought to wait until the Crown has the means of explaining to the House and to the country what were the reasons which induced it to reject the advice of its Ministers, in consequence of which they refused longer to continue in its service. When the time comes, the country will hear and judge; and, however well-disposed, as I am myself, to give the right hon. Gentlemen who have retired credit for the best intentions, the country will then also respect the scruples of the Monarch in following advice of a description which an honest English King might justly hesitate to adopt.

Lord *Althorp:* I do not rise for the purpose of entering at large into this discussion; but the hon. Gentleman has attributed to my noble friends sentiments and opinions which were neither uttered by them, nor, to my knowledge, uttered by any Member of the House. I did not hear any body make the sort of observations, regarding his Majesty, attributed to my noble friends by the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman calls upon the House to suspend its judgment until his Majesty's constitutional advisers are in a condition to explain. I hope and trust that the House will do so, and that it will not run away with any mistaken feeling regarding his Majesty's conduct, where it was possible to give it a fair interpretation. What my noble friends alluded to was, not the conduct of his Majesty; they alluded to what might have been the conduct—I say, what might have been the conduct—of any individuals, who, having opposed the Reform Bill in its principle and in its details, were, nevertheless, ready to accept office with a view to carry the very measure they had so strenuously resisted. To that state of things their observations applied; that was the public immorality to which they alluded; and I cannot think that the expressions they used were stronger than were merited by the occasion. With respect to the Reform Bill, whatever may be my feelings with regard to such a line of conduct, I may truly say, that I have heard, with considerable gratification, the hon. Member admit, in the strong terms in which he did admit it—first, that the general feeling of the country is in favour of the measure, and, secondly, however I may differ from him in the inference he draws from the circumstance, that a large measure of Reform is necessary to the peace and welfare of the kingdom. I rejoice that an hon. Gentleman of his influence should at length have arrived at that conclusion; and, although it may not be our lot to be the Ministers who carry the Reform Bill, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing, by the consent of all parties, that we have done a public service in introducing it. By our exertions, a Reform Bill—and a large Reform Bill—will undoubtedly be adopted. The hon. Gentleman says, and says most truly—at least, from hearsay, I can confirm his assertion—that, many months ago, he was of opinion it would be necessary to grant a measure of Reform. I know also, that although he was of that opinion, undoubtedly, in this House, he did not express it. I saw none of the effects of that conviction either in the hon. Gentleman's votes or speeches. Nevertheless, I am glad to hear, although he always spoke against the Reform Bill, that he always wished it well, and that, however he might have denounced it, he did not really think it unjust, revolutionary, or inconsistent with good government. He tells us, indeed, that he still thinks it will not be an improvement; but what he says regarding his future intentions is, undoubtedly, a great improvement. We may hope, therefore, as he has begun improving, that he will go on in the same course, and that, ere long, we shall see our Reform Bill carried, to the great satisfaction of the people, and, as we think, to the amelioration of the Constitution.

Mr. *Duncombe:* Within these few minutes, I have heard that a declaration has been just made in another place, by Lord Carnarvon, that the new Administration is for accepting some of the minor parts of the Reform Bill, and that it has been postponed until Thursday, in order that it may then be taken into consideration by the other House of Parliament. We know that the Duke of Wellington was appointed on Saturday last. We know also what was his first act. His first act was to insult the people of Birmingham. He sent back their petition, and refused to lay it at the foot of the Throne, on the idle pretext, that he knew of no such body as that from which it emanated. We are now to understand, that the Administration has been formed, and as the Bill is to be taken into consideration on Thursday, I suppose that the next we shall hear will be, that public principles, like public meetings, are "a farce." If the Duke of Wellington did not mean to pursue the Reform Bill, instead of postponing it until Thursday, the motion would have been, to discharge the order for taking it into consideration. Where he has found Ministers to fill his Cabinet, I know not; but we all know who was the noble and learned individual first employed to compound the Administration, and we now find, that that Administration is about to adopt the very Bill which it denounced only a few hours ago as revolutionary. I cannot say, that the measure has fallen into hands more worthy of it, or more worthy of the task of passing it. I do not deny the noble Lord's learning or talents, but his whole life has been one scene of political prostitution and apostacy. Again I say, of what materials the Administration will be formed, it is impossible yet to guess; but if it is to be composed of the opponents of the Reform Bill, their principles must be like certain vehicles, like crane-necked carriages, the advantage of which is, that they turn round in the smallest possible space. In such a vehicle must the Duke of Wellington go down to the House of Lords. What will be the beasts that draw him, who the charioteer that drives him, or who the pensioned lacquies that stand behind him, I know not; but this I know, that, under such circumstances, I would rather be the tailor that turns his coat than the Duke of Wellington with all his glories. But if the temporal Lords have no consciences to be consulted, what is to become of the spiritual Peers? Are the Bishops to be hung upon crane-necked carriages too? Are they of a sudden to fling up their mitres, and halloo for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." One of these right reverend Prelates made a most solemn appeal to the House upon the subject, and, as it has since been published from authority, in the shape of a pamphlet, I may be excused for quoting a passage from it. It was a speech delivered on the question that the Reform Bill be read a second time. "My Lords," said the Bishop, "but one thing is clear and bright, and one thing only—to walk uprightly is within your own power. As for consequences, they are in the power of God. Will you distrust that power? My Lords, you will not."* I say to the House of Peers—"My Lords, you will distrust that power, unless the Duke of Wellington and place are your God." The hon. member for Thetford has talked about the creation of Peers, forsooth—that it would degrade the House of Lords; but this base violation of public principle—this base violation of a public protest—will do more to degrade the House of Lords, than the creation of a hundred Peers.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* rose to order. Before he noticed the harshness of the expressions of the hon. member for Hertford, he wished to know whether he meant to say, that the Duke of Wellington had —[*cries of "order," and "spoke."*]

The *Speaker* remarked, that he did not consider it a question of order, nor did he require to be made alive to points of order when they occurred. It was quite evident, whether the gallant and hon. Member's opinion were correct or not, that he could not be in order in directing a question in that personal manner to any hon. Member.

Sir Henry Hardinge was again about to speak, but he was again interrupted by the impatience of the House.

Lord *Milton* said, it appeared to him,

---

* Hansard, vol. xii., (third series,) p. 287.

that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was himself out of order in the interruption he had occasioned.

Sir Henry Hardinge again rose; but the disturbance was so great, that he could not be heard; and, after standing for a few moments, he resumed his seat.

Mr. *Duncombe* proceeded. I repeat, that if the House of Lords be guilty of the base violation of public principle and a recorded protest alluded to, it will do more to lower them in the estimation of the people of England than the creation of a hundred Peers. I agree also with the right rev. Prelate I have already quoted, in another sentiment contained in his speech, where he says of the Lords, and let that House look to it:—"My Lords, if this House shall fall from its palmy state, it will fall by corruption from within. It will fall by the folly or the guilt—by the cowardice or the treachery of some—if there shall be any such—of its own degenerate Members."* I say, that they cannot be so degenerate; I do not believe that there are any such; that they will not so grossly violate the pledges they have given in the face of God and their country. But we are told, by the hon. member for Thetford, that the Duke of Wellington has, at last, heard the imperious call of the people for Reform; that the voices raised at those "farces"—public meetings—have, at length, reached him; and that the Duke of Wellington means to give us Reform. Reform from the Duke of Wellington! Reform from the Tories! We are to be taught Reform by these hon. and right hon. apostates. The people are to learn the value of Reform, as Dean Swift tells us the ancients learnt how to prune their vines; they found that when asses had browsed upon them, they throve more vigorously, and produced better fruit; so, in this case, because the Tories have, at last, nibbled at Reform, it is now to thrive vigorously, and to produce excellent fruit. I say, that what comes from so polluted a source must be corrupt, and that we ought never to distrust the Tories more, than when they affect to be liberal. But if this Administration be formed, what, I want to know, are they to do with this House? Will they dissolve the Parliament which the King called in order that it might speak the sense of the people? It has been said, that we have connected the King's name with Reform. Let me ask the hon. member for Thetford this:—Will dissolving the Parliament separate the King's name from Reform? Will dissolving the Parliament separate the names of other members of the Royal Family from Reform? I will give the House the titles of some of those members—the illustrious Cumberland and the sapient Gloucester [*cries of "Order."*]

The *Speaker* called the hon. Gentleman to order. It was irregular to mention any names, and not less those of the royal Dukes.

Mr. *Duncombe* expressed himself sorry that he should have trespassed on the Orders of the House. I will, however, add, he continued, that if the new Ministry should venture to dissolve this Parliament, they may depend upon it they will not better their situation, and the inevitable result will be, their defeat, disgrace, and dishonour. You may reject the petitions of Political Unions, but it will be in vain: the people will, and ought to be heard. On Saturday I heard that the petition of the Birmingham Union had been sent back. I had never before belonged to any of those bodies; but the moment I learnt that fact I enrolled my name. You may talk as you please about putting down Political Unions. I should like to see the question tried whether Political Unions can be put down. I maintain that you cannot put them down but by granting Reform. A Political Union is quite as legal and constitutional a body as that Political Union known by the name of the Cumberland or Conservative Club. I shall trouble the House at present no further; but in sitting down, I think it right to say, that I will oppose and defeat the new Administration by all the means the forms of this House allow. Out of doors I will adopt every possible constitutional measure to resist and embarrass them—by agitation, if you like to call it so, or in any other way, until I see those who have been the prime movers of this base outrage upon the nation's feelings hurled from their lofty station, and biting the very dust of Reform, amid the curses of an insulted people, and the execration of an indignant Parliament.

Mr. *Beaumont* referred to the recorded Protest of the Duke of Wellington, and remarked, that if a tree were to be known by its fruits, little reliance could be placed upon the disposition of the author of that

---

* Hansard, vol. xii. (third series) p. 286.

Protest in favour of Reform. The surrounding of the metropolis by military, and the rejection of the Birmingham Petition, were the first acts of the new Government, and distinctive of its character. But if the Government were to be destructive in its nature, he must call upon the House of Commons to stand forward as the conservative body of the State. It was his most anxious desire to remove the enemies of the people from the Councils of the King, and he certainly would do everything that was legal and constitutional in the way of agitation and resistance. From this moment he considered that there were only two parties in the kingdom—the party of Reform, and the party of the Duke of Wellington, and those who were not avowedly for Reform were, of course, to be reckoned in the number of its worst opponents.

Mr. *Macaulay* only wished to say a few words; and complained, in the first place, that the hon. member for Thetford had himself improperly introduced the Royal name for the sake of influencing the decision of the House. With all respect for the services and talents of his hon. and gallant friend (Sir Henry Hardinge) he must fairly and frankly, in the language of Parliament and of Gentlemen, and without the slightest admixture of personality, express what he thought of the conduct of the Duke of Wellington. Two evils grew out of the present state of affairs—one the danger of losing the Reform Bill, and the other, the deep injury inflicted upon the characters of public men—above all of one public man for whom he had entertained feelings of such high veneration that he would almost rather the disgrace should have fallen upon any other individual, however near or dear to him. He could not contemplate without the most acute pain, the possible degradation of perhaps the most illustrious name in British history. On the 16th of April, the Duke of Wellington, with the utmost formality, had declared, that the disfranchising clauses of the Reform Bill were shocking to all notions of justice—that the principles of the measure were destructive of the monarchy; and yet before the 16th of May, he had jumped to the conclusion, that all he before resisted was right, and all that he had declared needless was necessary. The Duke was now, it seemed, alive to the perils of the State—to the agitation of the public mind—to the earnest wishes of the vast body of the King's subjects—but did not all these exist before the 16th of April, or were his Grace's eyes only opened when he saw an opportunity of again obtaining office? If the recent division against the Reform Bill were the cause of the change in the public mind—if the Duke thought that it had produced it, it had been in his power to prevent it; and not having prevented it, he ought not to be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong. In signing the Protest, when he knew the state of excitement out of doors, the Duke had been guilty of one act of public immorality; and he was guilty of a second act of public immorality, if, having signed the Protest, he now at once abandoned its principles. What difference was there in the state of the question between the 16th of April and the 14th of May, excepting that at the first date the Duke of Wellington was in Opposition, and at the last date in place? If the characters of such eminent public men were to sustain this disgrace, it became the Representatives of the people to let their constituents see that the stain did not belong to them—that somebody might yet be trusted—that all were not ready to sacrifice principle to place. If those who had so repeatedly and so unanimously declared against Reform, now called themselves its advocates, it became doubly the duty of the House of Commons to take care of the Bill, and of its most minute details. If, when it was returned from the Lords, he saw that it still contained any important public good, he should readily support it. He thought that no pledge could be stronger than that which the Duke of Wellington made in his protest against the Reform Bill, and if that pledge should have been violated within one month, no other pledge of an Administration formed of those who subscribed to the Protest could hold out long. Therefore, he would say, that he should give no confidence to such a Ministry, coming into power upon principles directly contrary to those to which, in the protest, they had pledged themselves. He should, indeed, always support the Reform Bill, through whatever hands it might be carried; but on the day after the passing of the Bill, he should take such measures as might be the best calculated to show that the House could place no confidence in, and could give no support to, such an Administration. To state at once that he would take that course, was a duty which he owed to himself; for the present was a time when the character of public men required, above all things, to be carefully looked to; and he believed that the time was not distant when character and power would be synonymous. Therefore, if others wished to have infamy and place, let the House of Commons, at least, have honour and Reform.

Sir Henry Hardinge attempted to address the House, but cries of "Spoke, spoke," completely drowned his voice.

The *Speaker* said, that although the hon. and gallant Gentleman had already spoken upon the question before the House, yet, if he had anything to explain, or if he conceived that anything had been said which was contrary to the order and usage of the House, the House would hear him.

Mr. *Macaulay* said, that he believed he should be able to put an end to the discussion, if the House would allow him to say a few words. He would assure the hon. and gallant Baronet, that in anything which he had said he had no intention to swagger, as the gallant Baronet supposed. The gallant Baronet himself was not more aware than he (Mr. Macaulay) that it was absurd to use swaggering language in that House. But in what he (Mr. Macaulay) had said, there was nothing like menace or swaggering. All he said was, that if others—and he did not particularly point at any person—consented to have infamy and place, he hoped that the House of Commons would preserve its honour, and adhere to the Reform Bill.

Sir *George Murray* said, that the hon. Gentleman had used strong expressions, which he had no wish to imitate. For his part, he was always desirous to avoid the use of language which might give offence; and he thought that if at all times it was desirable for the Members of that House to proceed with temper and moderation, the present times especially required that they should do so. The hon. member for Calne had spoken of infamy being incurred by persons accepting places; but surely the hon. Gentleman must be aware, that in the present circumstances of the country, place could not be very desirable. But there might be an emergency which should induce men of honour and principle to take office, notwithstanding the difficulties with which they might have to contend. As to the course which it was supposed the new Administration meant to adopt, he must say, that it was the duty of public men to follow at any time the course which the public good, according to the circumstances of the times, required. It was too much to accuse Statesmen of inconsistency, because they adopted that course. But if the persons who were to constitute the new Administration were accused of inconsistency, he would take leave to ask, was there no inconsistency upon the other side? Had there been no inconsistency on the part of the noble Lord, the Paymaster of the Forces? It was always unpleasant to him to make charges against any one; but he now felt justified in asserting that the noble Lord, the Paymaster of the Forces, had both in his speeches in that House, and in pamphlets published under his name, expressed himself hostile to those very principles upon which he had since framed his Reform Bill. Besides, several colleagues of the noble Lord had frequently expressed themselves hostile to the principle of Reform altogether. When the noble Lord, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, whom he did not then see in his place, was on one occasion defending some of those Gentlemen from a charge of inconsistency, he said, that it was most improper and unjust to accuse Statesmen of inconsistency when they were induced to alter their policy, foreign or domestic, with the altered circumstances of the country. He recollected that, on that occasion, his right hon. friend beside him (Sir Robert Peel) joined with the noble Lord in repelling the charge of inconsistency which was cast upon public men for having altered their policy upon a particular question. It was, evidently, the wish of some persons in that House, and it was expressly the object of some who spoke to-night, to cramp the Sovereign in the choice of Ministers. He was very glad to observe that the noble Lord opposite (Lord Althorp) had assumed a tone different from that adopted by the persons to whom he alluded. That noble Lord had said, that if any measure was brought forward by the new Ministry, be they whom they may, which should seem to him to be beneficial to the country, he would give them so far his assistance and support. As to what had fallen from the hon. member for Hertford, who gave an illustration respecting the vine, he could not help smiling, for the Tories were not the persons who had browsed in the spot to which the hon. Gentleman alluded. The noble Lord, the member for Northamptonshire, had drawn a distinction between loyalty and that sort of attachment which induced men to bend to all the caprices of the Sovereign, but there was yet no reason to accuse any persons of that sort of blind devotion. Without the fullest information, the House ought not to be persuaded that the King had acted with caprice. There had been no proof that his Majesty had abandoned the principles to which, in his Speech from the Throne, he had before pledged himself; or that he did not still entertain the sentiments which he was known to have expressed. All they knew was, that his Ministers made to him a proposition with which he did not think it right to comply. But they did not know what were the circumstances which induced his Majesty to think that he ought not, at the time, to do what his Ministers advised him to. Under these circumstances (and he spoke there only as an individual, and without authority from any quarter whatever)—it appeared to him, that the only line which it became the House to follow was, to support the Crown.

Captain *Berkeley* said, that heretofore he had always doubted that it would be a wise or expedient course to create new Peers, for the purpose of carrying a particular measure. But now all his doubts were removed. The occurrences of the last week had convinced him that new Peers ought to have been created. As that had not been done, it remained for the House of Commons to send up to the Lords a Bill of Supply in company with a Reform Bill. He did not think that, in such a case, the House of Lords would venture to separate what the Commons had joined. The speech of the hon. member for Thetford had been alluded to already by several speakers, and he also would advert to one topic introduced by that Gentleman. Coming into town that morning, he saw several detachments of the army on their march. Now, certainly it might be, that they were merely changing quarters; but the appearance of troops moving from place to place at the present conjuncture was enough to "fright the isle from its propriety." He agreed with the observations of the hon. member for Calne, and would join with that Gentleman in taking measures to show that they had no confidence in the men whom it was understood the King had taken to his councils, and he was sure that the country would also show that it reposed no confidence in those persons.

Lord *John Russell* felt himself called upon, on an occasion like the present, to show that the conduct which was said to be borne out by his example was in every respect dissimilar to everything that he had ever done. He thought it to be his duty, in such a case, to lay before the House his own conduct and that of the Gentlemen, whoever they might be, who were about to take office as Cabinet Ministers. It had been said, that he had changed his opinions on the subject of Reform. His opinions had at all times been expressed just as he entertained them at the time; and yet all that could be brought home to him on the subject of change of opinion was, that, from having been a Reformer twelve years ago, and that not of the most moderate class of Reformers—from being a Reformer who proposed to take 100 Members from places now represented in that House, and to give them to the counties and great towns—from being such a Reformer, he had come to be the advocate of that Reform which for a long time he had endeavoured to render unnecessary—namely the total disfranchisement of the nomination boroughs. But that change in his conduct had been brought about, first, by the obstinate resistance which had been made by the Government now coming into office to the most moderate Reform; secondly, by the altered condition of the country; and, thirdly, by the opinions of many persons of the highest authority, differing from each other on the question of Reform. He would mention two of those persons, by whose opinion he had been influenced, and it would be admitted that they had few opinions in common upon the general question of Reform—Lord Grey and the late Mr. Canning. It was the opinion of both those statesmen, that, if any measure of Reform was to be carried, it ought to be founded on such principles as would render it final, so far as it was possible for the Legislature to make it so. On these three considerations it was, that he had come to the opinion, that, if a Reform were effected, however extensive it might be in other respects, but which should leave seats in that House avowedly at the disposal of individuals, the question would still be left open to discussion, and there would still be a call for further Reform. Such was the nature of the inconsistency which could be charged upon him. But it could not be said, that, like some, he had changed from a Reformer to an Anti-Reformer, nor had he, like others, changed suddenly from determined hostility to all Reform to the support of such a measure as that House had passed. He had changed only from moderate to extensive Reform, that change being effected in him by the necessity, as he had said, brought on by Gentlemen opposite—by the change in the condition of the country—by the opinion of the great men to whom he had alluded—and, above all things, by the effect produced in the country by the declaration of the Duke of Wellington, that no Reform was necessary—that the system of Representation was as perfect as the wit of man could devise, and that he (the noble Duke) would never consent to any Reform of any kind whatever. Such were his reasons for agreeing with his noble friend (Earl Grey) in the interviews which he had with him in the commencement of his Ministry, that any Reform which they should determine to produce ought to be of so decided a character, as to give a hope of a resting place on this subject. But he would put it to the candour of Gentlemen opposite, and of the right hon. Gentleman who had appealed to him (Sir G. Murray), whether the change which had taken place in his opinions in the course of twelve years was equal in amount to the change which had taken place in the opinions of some Gentlemen within the last twelve days. In twelve days those Gentlemen had changed from opposition to all Reform as revolutionary, to the support of that Reform which they denominated as the most revolutionary that could be devised. It was now a matter of boast with their friends, that those persons who signed twelve days ago a declaration that they opposed the Reform Bill as revolutionary, subversive of the Constitution, and dangerous to the Crown, were now taking office pledged to carry that same measure. He trusted that, having said so much on the appeal which had been made to him, the House would indulge him whilst he said a few words respecting the crisis in which the country was placed at present. In doing so, he should not be induced by the artful attempt of the hon. member for Thetford to drag the King's name into the discussion. He should not be provoked, by that hon. Member's taunt, to lift the veil from before the Throne, and bring the King's personal character into the debate. According to the Constitution, there was no doubt that the King had the prerogative to reject any advice which his Ministers might offer to him, and it had been the usual indulgence of the Kings of this country to their confidential servants, to accept the resignation of any man who felt in his conscience that his services could no longer be performed for the good of the country. But it was no less undoubtedly the right of that House to withhold its confidence from any Ministry which his Majesty might be advised to call to his councils. At the present moment there were two great questions in which the country was deeply interested. The first was Reform; the second was the composition of the Administration by which the country was about to be governed. In the latter question the character of public men was deeply involved. As to the Reform Bill, he would say, with his hon. friends who had spoken before him, that he was prepared to give it his utmost support, whoever might be the persons that should conduct it through that House provided only that they carried it through untouched in its principles. But he would own that he felt a difficulty in trusting much to the future prospects of the Bill, and that difficulty was not diminished by what had fallen from the hon. member for Thetford. He could not see what the reason was wherefore that hon. Gentleman had not professed the same sentiments a week ago, and declared himself ready to support the Bill. Was the sentiment with which hon. Gentlemen had acted to be expressed in these words:—"We will not object to the Bill if you give us your places; give us your offices and we shall carry your Bill." Well, if they had plainly and honestly avowed that sentiment, or if they had given an intelligible intimation that they entertained such views, Lord Grey would have willingly given up his office and the Bill together into their hands. He would have said, that office was to him an occasion of pain, a pillow of thorns, and that he would give up the Bill to them if they would carry it as it was; that is to say, if they would revoke every pledge which they had ever given, and retract every sentiment that they had ever uttered. But, if the sentiments of those Gentlemen had not undergone the change which was supposed to have taken place in them—if they were determined to mutilate the Bill, or to introduce clauses into it which would deprive the people of the power to control their Representatives, in that case the Reform Bill would be essentially different from that which it was when sent up from that House, and it would be such as might account for those Gentlemen's support. He was, indeed, very doubtful that they would carry the Bill without making alterations to suit it to their opinions, unless they should be induced to preserve it as it was, for the sake of obtaining office, which really seemed to them, even on such terms, an object of ambition. But if they should not mutilate the Bill—if they should send it back to that House with alterations only in some minor points not affecting the principles, or the more important of its provisions, he would make no objection to such alterations. Now, there was another question — no less important than the question of Reform—respecting the character of public men. When he attached so much importance to that question, he was only uttering the sentiments which the Duke of Wellington had expressed in stronger terms, on the question respecting the retirement of Mr. Huskisson from office, and when that gentleman made it the condition of his remaining in the Administration that the Duke of Wellington should solicit him to remain. The Duke, thinking it below the dignity of his station to make such a solicitation, said, "However sensible I may be of this loss, I am convinced that, in these times, any loss is better than that of character, which is the foundation of public confidence."* Such being the sentiments of the noble Duke, he would never place himself in a situation in which the people would be able to say to him, that he had violated his pledges, and falsified his opinions, and that, in future, with whatever solemnity he might pledge himself to any line of conduct—with whatever earnestness he might state his opinions, the public could never have confidence in the man who could sweep away in one day the most solemn protestations of his whole life. If the Duke of Wellington should place himself in this situation, there was not a person in the country who would not exclaim against it, except, perhaps, the hon. member for Thetford, who seems to think and to express surprise that they did not

———"overcome us like a summer cloud———

But he could assure the hon. Gentleman that the people attached considerable importance to the characters of the persons to whom the affairs of the country might be intrusted. The Duke of Wellington himself was no ordinary person. He was one in whose character the whole country was interested. Having said thus much, in reply to the hon. member for Thetford, he would beg leave to say a few words in reference to the right hon. member for Tamworth, who had been alluded to in connection with the present subject, and respecting certain reports which were in circulation. It was said, that the right hon. Gentleman was not about to take place in the new Administration. To that rumour he did not hesitate to give credence. He had ever spoken of the right hon. Gentleman with respect; and, indeed, he had regretted, solely from the respect he had for his public character, that he had consented to remain in office whilst another great question, to which the right hon. Baronet was known to be opposed, was carried. But he believed that the right hon. Gentleman was so entangled that he could not escape, and that his conduct was influenced by the purest motives. Therefore, and from all that he had seen of that right hon. Gentleman, he readily gave credence to the statement that he would not take office in the present conjuncture, and he was sure that the right hon. Baronet would not form part of a Cabinet, into which honour could not enter. But, perhaps, as had been suggested, the right hon. Gentleman might yet think himself placed in a situation in which he ought to give his support to the Administration, although he would not consent to take part in it. But the right hon. Baronet had often before expressed his sentiments on the question of Reform, and it appeared to him that those sentiments were such as must prevent him the right hon. Baronet from giving his aid to such an Administration, and from bringing to its support that eloquence which, strengthened by his high character, had so often gained the support of the House to the measures which he favoured. The right hon. Baronet's sentiments on this subject had been recorded on a very late occasion, and he would venture to read the terms used by the right hon. Baronet. But he would first premise that, last year, very much to his regret, the right hon. Baronet stated, that he could agree to some measure of enfranchisement, as that was altogether a matter of expediency, but that to disfranchisement he could never assent, as that involved a question of justice, and that to an act of injustice nothing should force him to be a party. On the third reading of the Reform Bill the right hon. Baronet having enumerated all the evils which he believed the measure would produce, and having supposed some liberal and enlightened individual in future times sighing after the blessings which the nation had enjoyed under the present Constitution, and breathing forth bitter reproaches against those who had forfeited for him his bright and precious inheritance, concluded with these words: "That he might not be summoned to the bar of posterity, to answer these questions; that his name might be exempt from the reproach which they involved; that, in every vicissitude of public and private fortune, he might be enabled to cling to the consolation of having struggled in this contest with perseverance, and of having resigned it without dishonour, his last vote should be given like his first—in opposition to this Bill."* Such were the sentiments of the right hon. Baronet at the time when last he gave a vote upon this question. He presumed, therefore, that, having given his vote, and upon those grounds, the right hon. Baronet could not be induced by anything that had since occurred to vote in another way under another Administration. But he understood that there were others who, on the same occasion, gave their last vote on the same question, and who were now ready to give another last vote in direct contradiction to all their other votes. It was not for him to regret that they should do so. On the contrary, let the Bill be passed, and he should rejoice. He should gladly accept the boon, by whatever hands it might be conveyed. The Bill would be a great and permanent benefit to the country. It would secure peace and good Government; and such a measure was not to be rejected on account of the party from from which it might come. But he would say now, once and for ever, that, after that measure should have been passed, he could give no support or confidence to those who, in carrying that measure, would stand in the face of the country publicly dishonoured.

---

* Hansard, vol. xix. (new series) p. 927.

Sir *Edward Sugden* said, that it might be very well for Gentlemen to speak of infamy and dishonour attaching to those who accepted office; but Gentlemen must be aware, that he for one could not accept office, without incurring loss and inconvenience, and could, therefore, be influenced only by a feeling of public duty. He had not come down prepared for the present discussion. He had not brought with him, like the noble Lord, carefully selected quotations, to enable him to cast imputations upon others. He was sure that nobody would deprecate more than hon. Gentlemen opposite, the reading of partial extracts from one of their speeches, without giving them with the context. He would ask the noble Lord opposite, if he did not, upon one occasion, say, that he should look upon the disfranchisement of Gatton and Old Sarum to be as great an infraction of the Constitution as anything that had been done by King James 2nd?

Lord *John Russell* begged to explain, that what he had said upon the occasion referred to was, that the franchise of Gatton or of Old Sarum was a trust, as the Crown was a trust, and that when the Legislature deprived those places of the trust, that ought not to be done except upon as good grounds as those upon which King James had been expelled.

Sir *Edward Sugden* would not then go into the question as to whether Gatton and Old Sarum ought to be disfranchised; but when the noble Lord thought proper to attack Gentlemen upon his side of the House for having changed their opinions, he thought it right to remind the noble Lord that he himself was liable to the same charge. He never was more surprised than when he came into that House, and heard it complained, of that Gentlemen upon that (the Opposition) side of the House had mixed up the King's name with this discussion. He would ask the House, whether it was not by the Gentlemen opposite the name of the King was first brought forward in this question? They united it with the name of the people; and he would desire nothing more earnestly than that the King's name should always be united with the name of the people, only that from that union the aristocracy should not be omitted. The noble Lord had said, that the present was a question of character. Well, in what way was the character of the Duke of Wellington compromised by the course which he had adopted? He was sure that his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel) could not be pleased to hear himself lauded at the expense of the noble Duke. He was sure that his right hon. friend placed confidence in the noble Duke, as did also a great portion of the people. So far as the character of public men was concerned, he thought that the reproach was to be cast on others, not upon the Duke of Wellington. During the debate upon the second reading of the Bill he had paid particular attention to the speech of the noble Duke, and to the reply; and the only thing which he at that moment had in his pocket was an extract from that reply. The noble Earl (Earl Grey) said to the House of Lords, "Pass the second reading of the Bill, and then the Bill will be in your hands, and not in mine. If you interfere with its principle, I will oppose such interference, but still it will be for you to decide whether or not you will make the alterations." He (Sir E. Sugden) declared solemnly, that when he heard the noble Earl use these words, his full conviction was, that Lord Grey meant to convey, that there would be no creation of Peers, and that, after the second reading, the Bill would be altogether in the hands and at the discretion of the Peers: for what other sense could be given to the words of the noble Earl, than that it was his intention not to interfere with the House, but leave the Bill entirely to their Lordships' discretion. But now his firm conviction was, that the Ministers had determined that neither the House of Lords nor that House (the Commons) should in any way modify the Bill, otherwise than as they (the Ministers) should think best suited to their own purposes. Did not the country know, that the principles of the Bill had been altered by the Ministers, without any good reason having been assigned? The qualification had been altered. An alteration had been made in the schedules, both of disfranchisement and of enfranchisement; and in other respects the original Bill had been departed from in its most important principles. But these changes were made by the Ministers themselves, and yet they refused to both Houses of Parliament the right to interfere with the Bill in any respect. What was the advice which was understood to have been given to the King on the present state of the Reform Bill? Nothing less than to deluge the House of Lords by the creation of sixty or seventy new Peers. Was there any man, acquainted with the past history, or the present political state of the country, who could for a moment doubt that the adoption of such a course would give to the Constitution a fatal stab? What! seventy Peers to be brought into that House pledged to a particular measure? He believed there was not a man of sane mind throughout England, or, he might add, throughout Europe, who would for a moment hesitate to admit, that such a measure would have the instant effect of degrading the House of Lords far below anything which even its worst enemies could devise. He was at a loss to imagine anything more calculated to degrade the House of Peers than the sudden introduction of seventy Peers to the House of Lords—introduced, as it was intended they should be, for the purpose of drowning the opinion of the House of Peers. If he were right on the point to which he had just before been alluding, the matter that they had then under their consideration resolved itself into this, the late Ministers must have carried their point, or have been defeated; they had been defeated, and they said to their political adversaries, "You must pass the Bill as we left it to you, and so destroy your own characters for consistency, or you must reject and incur the utmost possible hazard to the country from the state of excitement in which we have left men's minds." He had no difficulty, then, in saying, that being in possession of the Government at such a crisis, the noble Lords and right hon. Gentlemen opposite were not justified in abandoning the guidance of public affairs, and leaving the King, the Country, and the Legislature, in the position in which they had been placed—they should not have abandoned the Government for the sake of destroying the party opposed to them in politics; neither should they have endeavoured to swamp the House of Lords for any such unworthy purpose. With respect to the conduct of the Duke of Wellington, which had that night been made the subject of so much animadversion, it did, he confessed, appear to him, that the Duke of Wellington was perfectly justified in the course which he had taken

---

* See Hansard, (third series) vol. xi. p. 764.

—with the prospect before him of seeing the House of Lords swamped, he could scarcely have taken any other—and in the exercise of a sound discretion, and under the influence of an exalted patriotism, he took the commands of his Majesty to form an Administration, and thus at least avoid the evil of destroying the House of Lords. There was one truth, however, established beyond any possibility of dispute, namely, that the present Government of the King found nothing but a choice between two evils. If hon. Members believed, as he did, that the Duke of Wellington was not influenced by any desire of place — he knew how difficult it was, to reconcile all opinions and unite all voices; but if they believed, as he did, that the Duke of Wellington, as a public man, stood far above all mercenary considerations—above all motives arising out of a mere desire of place, they must feel that, in accepting office at the present moment, he was making one of the greatest sacrifices which it was in the power of any public man to make for the good of his country. Yes, he would repeat, that the sacrifices which that noble person made, admitted of no limitation or qualification. That which he had done, or was about to do, constituted one of the basest acts of which any man was ever guilty, or an act of the greatest magnanimity and public virtue; an act which, as it would surpass anything that our past history afforded, so it would eclipse the glories of future ages. He would repeat the expression, and appeal to all impartial men, and to posterity, for the truth and justice of the sentiments which he thus conscientiously expressed, that the noblest act of the long and distinguished life of the Duke of Wellington, was the acceptance of office at a crisis dangerous to the Constitution, and one which carried with it enough of difficulty, delicacy, and hazard, to deter all ordinary minds from grappling with it. Such were his sentiments of the conduct of the Duke of Wellington, and if they were well founded, and the noble Duke could not be proved to have been guilty of the basest and most disgraceful conduct a public man had ever fallen into, then he deserved, and ought to receive, universal approbation; and more for that than for any act of his public life.

Viscount *Palmerston:* I should certainly not have risen to take any part in the present debate, had I not been personally alluded to by the right hon. and gallant member for Perthshire. I have been charged with changes of opinion upon great public questions. Against such charges I feel that no defence is necessary in this House. I have no difficulty in saying, that I have changed my sentiments, and that I have done so from having become wiser. With respect to my own public conduct, I should greatly regret being compelled to defend it upon any grounds that might involve an accusation against others — accusations which it would be no less painful to me to utter than it would be to the right hon. and gallant Member himself to hear. It is known both to the House and the public, that I have retired from office for the sake of preserving the free expression of my opinions, and freedom of action, on political questions upon which I felt deeply interested. It might also have been known to the right hon. and gallant Member, that it has happened to me, when out of office, to decline the service of the Crown, when I felt that, in accepting that service I should have incurred the hazard of not being at liberty to assert my own sentiments as I felt I ought. With respect to the concluding part of the speech of the right hon. and gallant Member, in which he blames the late Administration for having abandoned office at a moment when it was peculiarly their duty to have remained in the service of the Monarch, there was not a man in the country who thought that they could, with anything like honour, have remained in power—no men of honour could have done so under the circumstances. We are told that we have been guilty of a violation of the Constitution, in the advice given to his Majesty to create a sufficient number of Peers to carry the Reform Bill—advice in which I fully participated. Now, I deny altogether that the advice referred to was any violation whatever of the Constitution; though, at the same time, I am perfectly ready to admit, that it was advice which should only be given in extreme cases; but what I contend for is, that that extreme case had arrived; and I have no doubt that the country, as well as posterity, will ratify that decision. The majority in the House of Lords against the Bill was so large, that it was obviously impossible that we could have remained masters of the measure. The right hon. and gallant Member opposite stated a declaration made by my noble friend at the head of his Majesty's Government as to the course which he intended to pursue in the event of the Bill having been read a second time in the House of Lords. His declaration was, after the second reading of the first Bill had been lost, that he would remain in office so long only as there remained a rational prospect of carrying the measure in a satisfactory shape — that pledge he certainly redeemed, for he did not retire from office till all prospect of that sort had totally disappeared. For the purposes of the argument which had been carried on upon the other side, it was said that the division in the House of Lords, which drove the late Administration from office, was a division upon a subject of no real importance. But that made no difference in the real state of the case. If the House of Lords had chosen to place the Government in so decided a minority, upon a question of no importance, and upon a point of mere legislative pedantry, as to which of two clauses should have the precedence, the hint was a broad one, and the Government could not pretend to misunderstand it. If on the contrary, the question was one of importance, and involving a principle of the Bill, which I contend it was, then equally the Government had no option left as to what it should do; but I believe that it will be now universally acknowledged by all candid and impartial men, that the division in question was really one of importance, and of the highest importance; for here was a measure upon which the existence of the Government as a Government was staked, and suddenly we find ourselves in such a situation that we lose all command or control over the measure, and we are outvoted by a very large majority of the House of Lords. It is almost instructing the House upon first principles, to tell them that no Government can carry on the business of the country, if it do not possess the confidence of both Houses of Parliament, and yet, in order to answer the arguments from the other side, I am compelled to remind the House of that fact. Really, it is almost too absurd to say that the question upon which the House of Lords divided the other night was not one involving an essential principle. They told us that they would proceed with enfranchisement first; and why?—because they thought it might be possible that the necessity for disfranchisement might be greatly diminished, or altogether removed by a previous inquiry into the amount of enfranchisement; that, at all events, a less amount of disfranchisement would suffice. Surely that involved the very principle of the Bill—to alter the detailed arrangement for such a purpose, and in such a manner, was to alter its most important principle, for the very essence of the Bill was the disfranchisement of the nomination boroughs; failing to carry the principle of disfranchisement, nothing remained for us but resignation. We must have either abandoned the Bill or resigned our offices. We had no choice between these two.

Sir *George Murray* wished to say a few words in explanation. The noble Lord had made his speech on a total misconception of what had fallen from himself. He had never accused the noble Lord of inconsistency of opinion. He did not wish to drive the noble Lord into the discussion of the conduct of others, but as far as he was himself personally concerned, he could assure the noble Lord that he did not fear such discussion.

Viscount *Palmerston* said, that he would not be provoked by any taunts from the other side to express opinions which would be as painful to the gallant Officer to hear as they would be to himself to express.

The *Attorney General*, after bearing his testimony to the able manner in which his hon. and learned friend (Sir Edward Sugden) had stated his objections to the measure of Reform in the Committee in that House, proceeded to observe, that he would release his hon. and learned friend from the difficulty in which he might hereafter be involved from the construction put upon some words which had fallen from him. He did not understand him to say, that he would not consent to hold office at the present crisis—but only that office and the emoluments of office had to him no attractions, on account of the loss of private practice which it must entail upon him, and would not compensate. He was satisfied that his hon. and learned friend would not then or at any time accept office, without a thorough conviction that he could do so with honour. He rose, however, not to observe upon what his hon. and learned friend had stated; his object was, to reply to the hon. member for Thetford—the defender of a

Government—or rather let him say, of the phantom of a Government, or perhaps more properly of a something, which like the White Lady of the romance, was now growing under our eyes into the consistency of a phantom.

Mr. *Baring* assured the House that he had nothing to do with the new Government.

The *Attorney General:* The hon. Member disclaimed the new Administration, which he had undertaken to represent—

Mr. *Baring* again interrupting.—The hon. and learned Gentleman ought not to describe him as speaking for those whom he had no authority to represent. He had no authority to speak there for any body but himself.

The *Attorney General:* The House had understood the hon. member for Thetford to be so kind as to inform it that he had no connection with the Administration now forming, but in that case, he knew not by what pretence or authority that hon. Gentleman had taken upon himself to read to Members of the House, and especially to the noble Lords who needed them the least of all men, those lectures upon good faith, upon honour, upon what common decency even required! Volunteering his uncalled for censures, if not as the Representative of a phantom Government, then, doubtless, as the intended representative of some future more substantial Government. He could not help congratulating the House on the benignant manager, the courteous leader, it was about to possess, in the hon. Gentleman. He could not help, as a humble individual, offering to the hon. Gentleman his grateful thanks for the great kindness with which he had treated him (the Attorney General) the other day in his absence. He had been told, that, during his absence, one of his hon. friends had called the hon. member for Thetford to account for having spoken of him as a mob-courting Attorney General, and that the answer given by the hon. Member was this—"If I did call him the mob-courting Attorney General, it was a long time ago, and, therefore, I am not bound to explain that phrase now." Admitting that excuse to be valid, he had still another point to settle with that hon. Member. He had been told, or he had read, or he had heard something uttered by the hon. Member to this effect — that atrocious libels had lately been published regarding the Queen and other members of the royal family, and there was no Attorney General to put them down. Now, this charge was made in consequence of an article which appeared in a newspaper on the day after that on which the Attorney General sent in his resignation. He asked whether, under such circumstances, the proceeding of the hon. Member was generous—nay more, whether it was just? Was the imputation which he had cast upon the Attorney General one which he was justified in casting? He had no doubt that those somebodies and somethings, of which the hon. Member had spoken, whom nobody knew, and who were busy some where, but nobody knew where, had made the most of that imputation. He was ready, whenever he should be called on in a distinct and manly way, to defend his conduct against all who questioned it; but, on this occasion, he would confine himself to saying, that if he had consented to undertake such a prosecution as the hon. Member approved, he might have gratified some of the somebodies, but he should have rendered no real service to the Crown. What man was ignorant that the execution of the libel law rested entirely upon public opinion, and that any unfortunate interference with the Press would have recoiled upon the heads of those for whose pleasure it might have been made? But twice before had the hon. member for Thetford designated him as an individual incapable of serving the Crown as Attorney General, because, forsooth, he was the Representative of a popular place, and was known to entertain popular sentiments. He had taken the liberty of asking the hon. Member in private whether, when the hon. Member had the opportunity of observing his conduct before the Special Commission in Hampshire, there was any betrayal of his duty as Attorney General; and the answer which he had received from the hon. Member on that occasion was both courteous and satisfactory. He was really led to believe, that the hon. Member felt some personal kindness towards him, and was therefore, surprised to hear him that evening condescending to quote placards from the walls, and reports of violent sayings at public meetings, and dilating into a mock importance, those ebullitions of the public mind, which great excitement must ever produce, in order to fix upon him the charge of deserting his public duty. The hon. Member's ability, his knowledge of the world, his habits of thinking, made it impossible for him to believe that prosecution must put down such attacks, or adopt that vulgar opinion that an Attorney General and a libel could not exist at the same time. For the last fourteen months the hon. Member had been daily exercising his powers of sarcasm against the reforming Ministry, and he doubtless thought, that the strongest point of attack and insinuation was, the imputed negligence of their law officers with reference to these offences. In another particular, he would protest against the unfairness of the hon. Member's proceedings. The hon. Member had thought proper to say—"Don't force the Crown into this hostile discussion with its late Ministers; wait till the new Government is formed, and can give an answer, before you attack the King." This may be very convenient language for those who desire to enter at the breach; but the noble Lord who made the Motion, had not attacked the King nor the Ministers who had been compelled to state their resignation. The King's name was introduced into the debate by the hon. Member, and he was alone responsible for any mischief that might follow. But that was not all that the hon. member for Thetford said, for he went on to observe—"You have informed the people that there has not been fair dealing between the Crown and the Administration,—you have stated, that the Crown has acted not honestly, but treacherously, by it." Into that question he would not enter at present; for what had the question of whether the Crown had or had not given a promise to the late Administration to do with the question respecting the formation of a new Administration? The hon. Member well knew that these two questions had nothing in common; and yet he had joined them together in the same artful and invidious way in which other unions were attempted by the enemies of Reform. It was like the wisdom of the rotten boroughs, which menaced the downfall of the Church as sure to result from their own: but how great would be the folly of the Church, if it linked its fate with that of the rotten boroughs. So the aspirant to lead a new Administration, would bind the King's personal feelings to his schemes, and make a defensive alliance with the Crown, which never had been assailed, the pretence for an irreconcileable warfare against its late servants. With regard to the new Administration he would not say much, as it was still in a state of generation. The sooner suspense was at an end the better, that we might understand the nature of the power placed over us. Our present ignorance and uncertainty, resembled that of the Indian philosopher respecting the foundation of the world. He could teach that the world rested on a huge tortoise, and the tortoise on a monstrous elephant; but deeper he could not go; perhaps his third conjecture would have placed the elephant on the shoulders of a gigantic rat. Time, however, would bring these and all other hidden things to light He was happy to have had this opportunityof replying to the attacks which had been made upon him in his absence by the hon. member for Thetford, and which he must say were neither candid nor parliamentary. On the public measure now under discussion he would only say, that he went fully along with his hon. friends, who had expressed a hope that the country would not disgrace itself, nor mar its prospects, by turbulence or violence. He hoped that the people would give no excuse to those who were ready to calumniate and provoke them, and not unwilling to exhibit the sword,—which once displayed, might not so easily be replaced in its sheath. He was sure that there was not a single Member of the late Administration who would not willingly forego all future hopes of place for the satisfaction of seeing the Reform Bill carried through Parliament in an unimpaired and unmutilated form. An hon. Member had said, that the Reform Bill would be carried, even though the King's name should now be given to the Anti-Reformers. Ah, but how much better were it, if the King's name should have gone down to posterity in company with this great healing measure of which the necessity is now admitted on all hands. If that moment were his last, he would say to the House—"Care not for the men, but care for the measure, and benefit yourselves and your country by passing this Bill of Reform." Yes, if the House of Lords would only pass this Bill, he would never consider who the Ministers were that conducted it to a successful issue. The Bill itself was what the House had to look to, and what they must support in whosoever hands it might be. He could not conclude without making one observation on what was called the light and trifling nature of the circumstances, which it was said ought not to have induced Ministers to resign. Now, first of all, was the question raised by that amendment a question of their seeking? Next, was it not avowed by the waverers that a defeat on that question was a piece of humiliation which it was useful that Ministers should suffer? Lastly, was it not also avowed that this punishment was to be inflicted more than once upon them, to make them feel the advantage which they derived from such hollow support? Under such circumstances, what could they do but resign? And which of those who now blamed their arrogance, would have abstained from insulting their mean compliance, had they submitted to the humiliation for the sake of office? For his own part, he thanked the Ministers for the clear course they had pursued, not that he affected indifference to the advantages and emoluments of office—"*Quis negat hæc esse utilia?*" but he would gladly resign them all, provided he could see the success of this Bill, which, when passed into law, would render us the most free, the most happy, and the most contented nation on the face of the globe.

Mr. *Baring* said, the observation to which the hon. and learned Gentleman alluded, was quoted by an hon. Member as having been uttered by me more than twelve months ago. The hon. and learned Gentleman also says, that I have imputed blame to him for not prosecuting those persons who have been libelling the Queen. Now, I brought no charge against the hon. and learned Gentleman. What I said was, that there was a general tendency to vilify and degrade persons in power; and, amongst the rest, the Royal Family, who formerly used to be under the especial protection of the law, but who now seem to have no one to defend them. Whether the Attorney General ought to prosecute under such circumstances I will not say; but I chiefly quoted it as a specimen of the altered state of the times.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* said, after the long discussion which had taken place on this petition from the city of London, he should detain the House but with very few observations. The Corporation of London having expressed their sentiments upon the subject which now agitated the nation, the Livery of London, in this petition, followed the example it had set them. He trusted that this petition would be read distinctly, because he was satisfied that it not only spoke the sense of the people of London, but the sense of every large, intelligent community in the kingdom. A great deal had been said in vindication of the persons who were to form the new Ministry, and a more futile vindication he never heard in his life, and such was the general feeling of the House, for the announcement of the Duke of Wellington having accepted the office of Prime Minister did not excite a single cheer even from his friends. With respect to the resignation of the late Administration, it was the general opinion of the people that, consistently with honour and character, his Majesty's Ministers could not take any other course than they had done. That had been the sentiment simultaneously expressed by the public voice from one end of the kingdom to the other; and if the Government were undertaken by any of the persons who had signed the protest against the Reform Bill in the House of Lords, they would be universally considered as having no pretensions to public character hereafter. In the opinion of the public, which was also his, there could not be a greater demonstration of political apostacy than in the acceptance of office by those persons. Either they meant to give the Bill entire, or they did not. In the latter case, it was needless to say what would become of them; and in the former, he was sure they could not have the confidence of the country, and without that confidence it was impossible for any Government to be carried on. If the House of Commons now stood by the people, it would prevent a violation of the public peace, but if the people found they were abandoned by those whom they had sent to that House to protect their rights, there would be no answering for the public tranquillity.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, he never rose under a more reluctant and painful sense of public duty. But there were times when public men ought to make an open profession of their principles before the country, and the present was a crisis of that kind. In the phrase "public men," he did not mean to assume more to himself than was due to every one within those walls; and, in that general sense, as one who, however humbly and inadequately, yet still actively and zealously, had for some years taken a part in the proceedings of that House, he would state the principles which would lead him to act differently, he feared, from some of his friends. But public character was the best possession of a public man: it was the richest appanage of a nation; and, in proportion as a nation contained public men in whose principles their countrymen might feel a just confidence, in that proportion it had one of its best human resources, in times either of prosperity or of adversity. During all his public life, he had been opposed to the Whigs, but his objection had not been to them as a body, but to their measures. Least of all did he object to them as individuals, for to many of those now on the opposite benches he was bound by ties of early association and long intimacy, and their personal character he respected in the highest degree. His objection had been to the principles and tendencies of their public measures. If he might be permitted to say one word about himself, he would say, that he had endeavoured never to compromise any political opinions within that House, and never to carry a political enmity out of it. He had not said this to gain the cheers which had followed it, but to shew to the House the principles on which he desired to act now, as he had hitherto tried to act. His objection, then, was not to Lord Grey as an individual, but to the system of his Government. His opposition to the Reform Bill had not been an opposition to his noble friend, the Paymaster of the Forces, who introduced it, or to the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, with so much talent and temper—temper, without which no talent would have availed—conducted it through that House. His objection was to that Bill itself, by whomsoever adopted and supported; nor could he foresee any change of circumstances or of men which could induce him to give any vote in favour of it. It was a great evil in itself, and the source of incalculable evils. As such he had opposed it; as such he should continue to oppose it. Some passages in the speech of the hon. member for Thetford, and of the hon. and learned member for St. Mawes, had induced him to rise; and to which, therefore, he would call the attention of the House. The hon. member for Thetford assumed that such and such were the opinions of the King; and that no man, called to his Councils, could accordingly now approach his Sovereign, and advise him to act in any other manner. Now, in the first place, this assumed what might or might not be correct, as to the personal opinions of the Sovereign, upon which, he maintained, the House knew nothing; but it involved, in the next place, a great and unconstitutional error. While he held that the Sovereign could do no wrong; while he held, as an old Tory, that the King, as an original and inherent branch of the Legislature, had the same right to exercise his decision on any measure which might pass the two Houses—as either of those Houses—he could not forget also this other great constitutional truth, that the opinions and wishes of the King were known to the House in no other way than by his public acts, for which his known confidential advisers were responsible. When, therefore, he was told of the King being pledged to this or to that measure, and yet could not find it in his public acts, he must be permitted to consider that there was no constitutional authority for the assumption. Accordingly, any man now called to the councils of the Sovereign was, in his opinion, not only at liberty, but bound, to give his own opinions, and to act upon them only in the awful responsibility which he must himself sustain. He knew that the doctrine which he was about to advance would not be acceptable to the majority of that House; but, as he was not in the habit of qualifying his opinions, he would, without scruple, say, that, in his judgment, the clamour for Reform had, from the beginning, been greatly exaggerated, and that, whether or not there might be what was technically called a reaction, there was, at least, and certainly, a subsidence of the flood: the current was no longer so strong or so deep as it had been. Under these circumstances, he could have wished that the noble Duke, when summoned by his Majesty to his assistance, had, with the deepest respect for his Majesty, but with a just respect for himself, said to his Majesty—"The question of Reform which your Majesty submitted to the consideration of Parliament has undergone the most anxious and laborious deliberations. The experiment has been fairly tried; and, after fifteen months of discussion and agitation, during which time every branch of the industry of your people has been paralyzed, and greater discord has arisen than ever before divided England, there is no man who will say that this experiment is to be the last—there is no man who will point out to you any spot on which you can find rest for the sole of your foot. If, indeed, you can find in this measure, or in any other, any spot on which you may stand without the certainty that you will be driven from it by the wave of next year—if you can find any point where you can say that you will be safe, there take your stand; but, of all those who have surrounded your Majesty, there is not one who will satisfy your Majesty, that you will be able to make that stand at the present Bill. Say, then, to your people: 'I return to the Constitution under which I found you, and under which, whether in defiance of its alleged corruptions, or even, indirectly, through the means of what are called its corruptions, this country has been permitted to advance to its present unexampled greatness.'" This was the advice which he should have wished the noble Duke to have tendered to his Sovereign. But, without presuming to give any opinion upon what the advice actually tendered might have been, there was too much reason to believe, from what had passed here, and in another place, that a very considerable concession had been made, if not to every detail of the Bill, certainly to its essential provisions; and that, in fact, the new Government was actually to take charge, and had, indeed, already taken charge, of the Reform Bill. He did not pretend to know more or less than other Gentlemen on the subject; but it would be affectation to deny that they had all heard reports, confirmed by what had just passed in that House, which fully justified this belief. If this were so, he could not but regard the measure with the greatest pain, as one of the most fatal violations of public confidence which could be inflicted. He was willing to make the greatest allowance for changes of opinion in young men; but when he was told of men of mature age—statesmen, who all their lives had been opposed to a particular measure, who had in April protested against it as revolutionary, adopting it and making it their own measure in May, he must own, that he could imagine no consideration which could justify such a change of conduct. He did not accuse any one of love of pelf, or even of power; he did not say that ambition, that last infirmity of noble minds, had misled any one; but the conduct itself, from whatever motive, he must deprecate as fatal to that singleness and consistency of public character, which, as he had already stated, he considered to be the best property of public men, and, in them, of their country. He could not admit the necessity, because he saw, as he had already said, an alternative of safety. The noble Lord, the member for Northamptonshire, and his hon. and learned friend, the member for Calne, had accused the right hon. and gallant Officer, the member for St. Germain's (Sir Henry Hardinge), of having dragged into these discussions a name not to be mentioned here—the name of the King. Now, so far as he had understood, the noble Lord himself introduced the subject; and, in reference to the expression of the gallant Officer, as to the devotion and loyalty of the Duke of Wellington, desired that "such devotion and loyalty might not be submitted to the caprice of any man." He should be happy to be corrected if he had misunderstood the noble Lord; but to his (Sir R. Inglis's) apprehension, and to the common sense of all who heard him, those words could have but one meaning: and unless the noble Lord should deny that meaning, he could not but continue to believe, that the one man, of whose caprice he spoke, was the Sovereign. He thanked the House most sincerely for the indulgence with which they had heard him, in discharging a very painful duty.

Lord *Milton:* The hon. Baronet does not seem exactly to have understood what I said. My expressions were these; I hoped that there was in these realms no human being so high as to induce another to sacrifice to him, through loyalty or devotion, his own solemnly recorded opinion; and I must say, that I think the hon. Baronet himself has sanctioned, by his speech, every tittle of that sentiment.

Sir *Robert Peel:* I must say, that I have a strong feeling, that the House has this evening engaged in a discussion which, for many reasons, is injudicious. We are not in possession of that information which is essential for the purpose of forming a correct judgment on many subjects which have, in consequence, been argued hypothetically. Now, Sir, I take the liberty of suggesting to the House to consider the position in which the King of this country is placed. His Majesty has recently accepted the resignation of those who were his confidential servants. I can undertake to pronounce no opinion as to the course which they have assumed, because no explanation has been given in detail of the circumstances under which their advice was offered, so as to enable me to form a satisfactory judgment on the course which they have pursued. I certainly infer, that the case is this: that, in order to carry a certain measure through the other House of Parliament, the Ministers advised his Majesty to create a number of Peers. What that number was I know not. Some say, the power demanded was, to create an indefinite number; others have named thirty, forty, sixty, or seventy; but, at all events, to such an extent as would have proved fatal to the authority of the House of Lords. His Majesty declined to accede to that advice, and the consequence is, that the King is now attempting to form another Administration. Now, it appears, in the course of these debates, on this very day, that there is no one who has authority in this House to speak on the part of that Administration. The hon. member for Hertford, referring irregularly, but perhaps necessarily, to what has taken place in another House, has told us, that there a declaration was made, to the effect that another Administration was formed. If the hon. Member himself heard that statement, it is, of course, unlikely that there can be any mistake on the subject; but it certainly does seem strange, that an Administration should be formed, and that there should be no one in this House to give any explanation on the subject. If, therefore, the hon. Member has only spoken from report, I should be inclined to think, that that report must be erroneous. If the declaration alluded to was only to the effect that the King was occupied in attempting to form another Administration, without any explanation as to the principles on which that Administration was to be formed, I put it to the House, whether declarations of determined hostility to a hypothetical Administration, are not somewhat premature?

Mr. *Duncombe:* In what I said relative to what has taken place this evening in the House of Lords, I referred to what one of the Reporters had taken down. The passage that was read to me was to this effect—that Lord Carnarvon had risen in his place to say that an Administration was formed, except in some of its minor details; after which he went on to move that the Order of the Day for the Committee on the Reform Bill should be postponed till Thursday, thereby evincing that that Bill had now got into other hands.

Sir *Robert Peel.* The noble Lord, the Paymaster of the Forces, thought proper to refer to me with respect to the course I might pursue at this juncture. Now I will tell the noble Lord fairly, that I do not think that prudence or respect to the House requires me to make any answer to his observations on the present occasion. I think that the noble Lord's reference to me was entirely unnecessary; and I will tell the noble Lord further, that some time ago, when office was not within my reach, I stated that it was no object to me: now that it is within my reach, I will again repeat that observation; so that it will be seen that I claim no credit for any supposed sacrifice. If the noble Lord's inference is correct—that I feel unable to enter into the service of the Crown—I will at all events add this to it—that I bitterly regret, that in the situation in which his Majesty is now placed, I am not able to accept office; and that the greatest regret that attends my refusal of office is, the possibility of its affording an opportunity for sarcasm being pointed by contrast against those who feel themselves able to join the new Administration. Whatever course my noble friend (the Duke of Wellington) may pursue—whether or no I may be able to pursue that course too—this I will say, that I never felt a more perfect confidence of anything in my life, than that that course (be it what it may) will be dictated by the highest courage and the purest sense of honour that ever influenced the actions of any public man, either in accepting or in retiring from office.

Lord *John Russell:* I can assure the right hon. Baronet, that in what I said I had no intention of casting any imputation on him whatever. On the contrary, it was my sincere belief, when addressing the House, that the right hon. Baronet was not going to accept office; and, therefore, the words that I used could not be intended as any reproach to him. I conceive that the right hon. Baronet is much too careful of his public fame to accept office under present circumstances.

Mr. *Hume:* Sir, I wish to put a question to you, which seems to me of no little importance. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the Address of this House has been presented to the King: and if any answer whatever to that Address has been made? Four days have now elapsed since that Address was voted. The House, it appears, knows nothing of the matter; and it will be extremely satisfactory if you, Sir, are able to give us any information of any answer that may be expected.

The *Speaker:* The only explanation that I am able to offer is, that the Address was transmitted, and that it has come to the hands of the King's Establishment, into whose hands such Addresses are usually delivered, for the purpose of being presented. The reason for there not being any answer to that Address at the present moment I can only guess at like the hon. Member, or any other Gentleman. It may be, that the King feels, that not having responsible Ministers, it is better to delay his answer. For any certain reason, however, the hon. Member must not ask me; for I do not know more about the matter than any other hon. Member of this House. I only know that the Address was sent to his Majesty's household—that it is in the hands of the King—or that at least his Majesty has been apprised of it.

Mr. *Hume:* Am I to understand that the Address of the 10th of May is not yet in the hands of the King?

The *Speaker:* The hon. Member must be aware, that I am utterly unable to answer this question; and if he draws the inference that I mean so and so, I beg to inform him, that I meant nothing but to assure him and the House that the Address was regularly conveyed in the usual manner—that I have no doubt that it is in the proper channel—and that I presumed the reason for there being no answer yet, was the difficulty that there is as to the channel through which that answer is to be conveyed.

Petition brought up.

On the question, that the petition be read,

Lord *Ebrington* rose: After the allusion that has been made to me personally in the course of this discussion, I trust that I may be permitted to trouble the House with a very few words. The right hon. and gallant Officer who spoke early in the debate, and who I am sorry not now to see in his place [Sir Henry Hardinge immediately afterwards resumed his seat.] The right hon. and gallant Officer has charged me with having made an attack on the Duke of Wellington for a breach of public morality. I beg, however, to say, that I only put an hypothetical case; and upon that case I stated, as I now state, that, if it is true and correct, I can apply no milder term to the noble Duke's conduct. The noble Duke's friends are under a mistake if they suppose that there is anything in his great name, in his high situation, or even in his eminent services—which no one is more ready gratefully to acknowledge than myself—I say the noble Duke's friends are much mistaken if they suppose that there is anything in these circumstances which can screen his character, as a public man, from undergoing the same investigation, from being subject to the same discussion, from being judged on the same principles, and from being decided upon on the same grounds, with those of every other public man in this country; Sir, it is with this freedom and in this manner that I shall always assert my right as an independent Member of Parliament. I trust that I shall always do so with the respect that is due to this House, and in language becoming to myself as a gentleman; and, indeed, I do not believe that I am ever in the habit of bringing charge against my political opponents in any other language, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Thetford has been pleased to impute to me. That hon. Gentleman has thought proper to read me a lesson with respect to my supposed want of common decency, for such, I think, were the words that he presumed to apply to me. Sir, I will not bandy such terms backwards and forwards with the hon. Gentleman, but he must allow me to say, that, if there is any one in this House to whom I should be disposed to apply such language, it would be to him; rising this night, as he has done, to make a tardy defence of the political inconsistency, of himself and others, when I have heard him, time after time, in this House, raking up speeches made ten or twenty years ago, together with extracts from pamphlets; and, on the strength of these, applying to my noble friend terms of vituperation, which, until this Reform Bill was introduced, I never heard applied by anybody, in the greatest heat of political party, to any Minister of the Crown. Gentlemen seem this evening to have argued as if there was no alternative to be adopted by the noble Duke, in order to avert a forced creation of Peers by the King, except his taking the Government of the country, and dragging the Lords to the passing of the Bill. But, Sir, is there no third course? Is it absolutely necessary that those who have so deeply pledged themselves against the Bill should now be compelled to eat their words and to support it? I think that the right hon. Baronet, and some of those around him, are aware of the course to which I allude. If the noble Duke himself could stand up and say that the impossibility he finds to conduct the affairs of the country would make him use all his influence among his friends to give up their attendance on the Bill, he would succeed, no doubt, in putting an end to further discussion. I will not say when that should be done, or when it would come too late. If a course of that description had been adopted within the last few days, even within the last forty-eight hours, much peril would have been avoided to the country. The character of the noble Duke would have stood a great deal higher, and he would have entitled himself to the lasting gratitude of the country. At the same time the conduct of the House of Lords would have not been subject, as under present circumstances I fear it will, to the bitter execration of the people.

Mr. *Baring:* I hope the House will excuse me for again obtruding myself upon its notice, after what has fallen from the noble Lord. I can assure the noble Lord and the hon. Attorney General that the look and tone which it has pleased them to assume—the taunts they have thrown out shall not make me swerve from my opinion, or prevent me from fearlessly discharging my duty in this House. The noble Lord—but he said so many things that I hardly recollect what I should first reply to; yes, if the noble Lord, getting up with a high hand, using expressions in the course of the discussion implying that I am disentitled to the ordinary courtesy of the House—if the noble Lord chooses to make me the butt to that sort of expressions, I can only tell the noble Lord, that I hold them in utter contempt. From the time I have been in the House, I am sure that my reputation will not suffer from any such personal observations on account of a difference of opinion. With the leave of the House, I will say a little more on the question, notwithstanding such remarks. The objections I made to the course lately adopted is the same as that stated by my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Peel), viz. that the subject is not yet ripe for discussion. Respecting the conduct of the late Government, I avow that my opinions are made up; but the House has no evidence; it cannot know whom the Crown has employed to defend it. It is premature, then, to entertain the subject at present; but whatever situation I may stand in towards the House, when it can be fairly discussed, I shall fearlessly state my opinion. As to what the hon. Gentleman said about my inconsistency, or the inconsistency of a much greater man—for the Duke of Wellington, however much some people may now scoff at him, has a great debt of gratitude owing to him by the country—I must say, that neither he nor I have altered our opinions. We do not now say, that the Reform Bill, which we described as a bad Bill, is a good Bill. I do not hold any such opinion, and we have not changed. I am confident that we cannot be accused of inconsistency. The case, however, stands thus. His Majesty's Ministers, at a particular stage of that Bill, recommended a large addition to the Peerage. To that measure the King feels certain scruples, and these scruples will not allow him to do what is desired of him. It will not be said, that these scruples, at least, are not reasonable scruples, and that they are not conscientious; for the noble Lord at the head of the Ministry has stated repeatedly, in alluding to the creation of Peers as a measure that he might be compelled to have recourse to, that he should take the measure, about which the Crown has scruples, with reluctance—no, that is a weak term—but with the greatest repugnance. If that were felt by the noble Earl—and no man doubted his integrity—surely the scruples of the Crown were entitled to some respect. I know that, under whatever circumstances the name of the Crown and of the King is introduced in this House, it is unconstitutional; but, at present, it is impossible to do otherwise than mention them. The Crown has no confidential advisers in the House to make known its resolutions. A conflict has taken place between the Crown and its confidential advisers, and, therefore, at present, the King has no confidential advisers. The King did not choose to comply with the advice his servants have given, and the Ministers have resigned. I ask the House to consider what is the situation of the King since his Ministers have resigned? These scruples deserve some respect, and when the House recollects the persecution which they are exposed to, out of doors and in that House, who entertain these scruples, is it not extraordinary that any body should be found to give advice to the Crown? The act of advising the Sovereign now is not done under ordinary circumstances, for every man must be aware of the excessive excitement which pervades the country. It may, therefore, be fairly supposed that no man would voluntarily go to the Sovereign, but that the Sovereign would call upon some person to give him advice in the dilemma in which he is placed. I suppose—I do not know what passed—but I suppose that the King might have called for some person, and might have said to him, "I have assisted my Ministers in bringing forward the Reform Bill, since I found that the Government could not be otherwise carried on; and I made a pledge to my people, which I will not give up; but, at the same time, I am so placed, that I cannot admit, according to the Constitution, that the other branch of the Legislature should be forced to agree with the Commons, unless some very strong case of necessity should arise, and I do not see that any case has yet arisen in which I can fairly be called on to interfere, and I want your advice." Suppose the Duke of Wellington was the person so called upon, and he says "I am very sorry your Majesty, but I cannot advise your Majesty to pass that Bill at all. I do not admit the principles of this Bill." Here, then, the King, under the necessity of passing this Bill by his own pledge, is abandoned by the person whose advice he asks; and this adviser must see that Bill passed in all its deformity accompanied by what the King dreads, and all admit to be the greatest violence to the Constitution. I put it then to the House whether a man placed in the situation I have supposed the Duke of Wellington to be placed in, and possessing as he does unflinching integrity, joined to great moral courage—to that courage which enables a man in the pursuit of a good object to despise taunts and sarcasms—I put it to the House, whether such a man might not honestly and consistently say, "I will not forsake the King; I know to what I shall be exposed for changing my conduct, but rather than not save the scruples of the King—rather than have the Bill passed by a grievous violation of the Constitution, I will give up my own opposition, and I will assist the King in redeeming his pledge in a constitutional manner." I doubt not but the noble Duke may have come to some such conclusion; and what man can doubt the honesty and integrity of the noble Duke, or throw any suspicions on his consistency? I do not, any more than I doubt that the noble Duke possesses, as I say, much of that courage which enables a man to take such a bold and open part, and resist taunts and sneers and sarcasms. Against such sneers and sarcasms too, I shall support my opinion; and I have no doubt that the noble Duke would have, under such circumstances, the courage to give up his own opinions, and support the King in that conflict in which he is involved, because he does not choose to endanger the Constitution by committing a fatal violence on one part of it. That is, I take it, an honest view; and I shall say sincerely, that the noble Duke, without changing his mind—not seeing anything in the Bill to approve of, but seeing the state of excitement in the country—seeing the danger to which it might lead, supposing nothing else would end it—might resolve to stand by the King in this dilemma, and expose himself to all the difficulties of the situation, for the purpose of protecting his Sovereign. That appears to me likely to have been the course pursued; and that the noble Duke would not interfere to give his advice to the King till the King sent for him every man must be convinced. I will now say one word as to the necessity of such a resolution as was come to by his Majesty's Ministers. If the Ministers of the Crown had waited, they might have ascertained, in forty-eight hours after the Peers had given their vote, whether it was the intention of the Peers, by that vote, to defeat the Bill, or whether they meant to vote for the whole disfranchisement of schedule A. Upwards of one-half of the Peers who voted against the Ministers stated their intention of voting for schedule A. Now, schedule A was the key-stone of the Bill; and when that was the case, could the King not say, "the time is not arrived when I can be called on to exercise my prerogative: do not come to me with a vague report of what the Peers may do; put their intentions to the test—wait forty-eight hours, and see if they will vote for schedule A." It should be recollected that the Bill was safe in the Ministers' hands after the vote of the Peers. It could always be reinstated if injured, and it was not the same as if the Bill were actually in danger. I shall state fairly, that I have had many opportunities of knowing the opinions of the Opposition Peers, and I shall mention what I know of their opinions of schedule A. One of those Peers, who had a principal hand in managing the opposition to the Bill, told me, that he had no doubt that the Peers would pass the whole of schedule A. "My opinion is," said he, "after making my calculation"—I will mention no names—"my opinion is, that there will not be twenty votes against schedule A." That was before the question between the King and his Ministers had become the subject of public notice; and it was told me by one of the noble Lords who has undertaken to manage the opposition to the Bill. The measure proposed by the Ministers, is obviously one only to be resorted to in extreme cases: but there were no circumstances to justify such a measure, and the Ministers would not wait forty-eight hours to put to the test the opinions of the Peers. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Ebrington), said, he feared that there was no hope of accommodating these differences; but from some observations of the noble Lord, I hope the breach is not irreparable. I have had long experience in this House, and I never once saw a case, in which the Constitution was exposed to hazard, when the whole body of the landed Gentlemen did not interfere as mediators, and bring out some understanding on the matter. The noble Lord says—or at least his words, I think, bear that construction, though his intimation was rather vague—that he should be glad if anything could be done to give an approach even to such a proposal; and that, if the Peers would vote schedule A, that might induce the Ministers of the Crown to relax in their determination, and not to advise that which they only thought a less evil than not risking the measure. I should think myself, that if Lord Grey goes back to the King, and, stating his unwillingness to employ those means which he had already admitted he entertained a great repugnance to perform, and stating that he expected, with great probability, that the Lords would not differ from him, except as to the details of the Bill; if Lord Grey would so state to the King, I see no difficulty in the Ministers again taking their places. I do not see any objection to this. It is with entire sincerity that I state this. I say that I wish not to interfere in any Administration, and particularly in an Administration formed under the very difficult circumstances in which the country is now placed. To me, who never wished for public life, it would be a fatal thing, and nothing but the most urgent necessity should ever tempt me to take office in any shape. The right hon. Gentlemen opposite, whom I followed for twenty-five years, know that I never asked them for any place whatever. I shall not, therefore, be thought a person ready to do anything rash or base for the purpose of obtaining place. I shall state, that it would be with the very greatest reluctance that I should undertake any office, and that reluctance, great at any time, must be doubly great at undertaking it when I know, instead of having the House of Commons at my command, that the opposition I should meet with would make it a place of the greatest difficulty. At the same time, feeling the strength of my cause—feeling, in fact, that I ought not to abandon the King—there is no peril, no danger, no difficulty, I would not encounter, and nothing I would not undertake, which I thought conscientiously it was my duty, as an honest man, to undertake. But, as I said before, it would be much for the good of the country if the present Administration were not dissolved. That they should quit office would be one of the greatest calamities possible. When the Bill shall be passed, which has excited so many expectations in the country—and I see it is expected, as the result of this measure, as any hon. Member may learn by the canvass going on for the county of Kent, that it will lead to some great blessings—and with that expectation general in the country, it will be very unfortunate for the Government which shall be in office, when the expectations of the great advantages raised by this Bill—the extreme anticipations, indeed, shall be disappointed. The public will then say, if any other Ministry be in place—that if the Reform Government had remained in, something more would have been given to us. If I were looking to public life—and I am looking only to retirement—but if I were looking to public life, the last thing I should desire would be, to form part of an Administration to succeed the present Ministers. We have heard much of the blessings to be derived from this Bill; I wish, therefore, the present Ministry to have their full time to realise them, but when the disappointment comes, as come it must, that will then give any succeeding Administration which may want it an easy triumph. If any man—for example, my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Peel)—who finds it as difficult to keep out of office as ordinary persons find it to thrust themselves in, were ever so desirous of power, and possessed even of a grain of common sense, he could not wish to get into place at this crisis. I repeat, that for the sake of the country it is very desirable, that individuals should try and heal the breach between the Crown and its Ministers; and I am not without hopes, in consequence of what fell from the noble Lord, that some communication may be made to his Majesty, and that his Majesty might be relieved from that which he so much deprecates, and which is known by one word—swamping the Peers. It is not possible to deny that the Bill may pass, that schedule A may receive the assent of the Peers; and if the Peers do not refuse to pass schedule A, there is nothing to justify the Ministers in giving up. I find myself in a peculiar situation, and I make this statement to the House with perfect sincerity; and if I could assist in bringing about a settlement, without any injury to the Constitution, I can assure the House it would be one of the happiest moments of my life.

Lord *Ebrington* explained, that any thing he had said was entirely said as an individual, and that he did not know what was the determination of his noble and right hon. friends.

Sir *Francis Burdett* said, that from the manner in which the hon. Gentleman who spoke last had expressed his sentiments, more than ordinary weight must attach to what had fallen from him. No man could feel greater anxiety than he did under the unpleasant circumstances which had arisen, perhaps, without any fault; but certainly without any fault at least on the part of his Majesty's Ministers, who were placed in such a situation that it was impossible for them to retain office a moment longer than they had done. Every Gentleman who had spoken upon the subject laid great stress upon this point, and considered that, amongst the various duties of public men, there was none more incumbent upon them, or which it was more fitting that they should attend to with the utmost care, than to preserve that character and honour which, under the circumstances, was essential to their proper discharge of the trust confided to them. He had no doubt that his Majesty, in whose intentions and determination of fair dealing towards the public he, for one, firmly confided that every one must be satisfied, would fulfil the hopes that had been formed from the commencement of his Government: although his Majesty might feel himself placed in circumstances which were exceedingly difficult, and very much to be deplored, at the same time he had no doubt that the royal mind felt that, under the circumstances which had arisen, he was bound in duty to the Constitution to pursue the course which he had done. Still, however, he had no doubt that his Majesty felt that, under existing circumstances, his Ministers, by resigning, had not done any act of which he had reason to complain. He derived some consolation from the state in which affairs seemed at present to be placed. He trusted and hoped that some means might be found by which that measure might be brought to a successful issue, which was now become imperatively necessary. It was useless now to discuss whether that measure was right or not originally, or whether it could have been more wisely avoided, or more usefully adopted, for he believed that all were now come to this conclusion, that, under the present circumstances of the country, Reform had become inevitable. It therefore appeared to him, that the plain conduct and duty of an honest man to his country, and of a loyal man to his King, was to endeavour, as far as was in his power, to aid in such a course of proceeding as would most effectually tend to serve all parties, by accomplishing that object which was so much to be desired. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, had reasoned upon this part of the subject in a manner which suggested to his mind a kind of feeling, that it was precisely the way in which the royal mind was likely to have reasoned upon it. No man could for an instant suppose that his Majesty had any object in view but that which should be best for the country. He had no private views or wishes; so much the reverse, that he believed he was perfectly grounded in saying, that no wish of his had been ever expressed which did not tend to the advantage of the country, and that no subject was submitted to him, in any one department of the State, in which he was not ready to forego his own convenience for the good of the country. He had said, "Act as you think fit and right; consider not my convenience. Pay every possible regard to economy, and whatever the country thinks good enough for me, I shall feel good enough for myself." It would be hard if such a Sovereign, willing to sacrifice all personal objects for the good of the people, and who, ever since his accession, had shown the most kind and beneficent heart; who had never manifested a feeling of encroachment upon the popular liberties, nor been known by a single measure of a harsh nature, but, on the contrary, had done acts of kindness of various descriptions to the public in every way—it would be hard indeed, he said, if such a Sovereign were to be deprived, by misapprehension, of the affections of his people, which no Monarch had ever more truly deserved. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, in what he stated with respect to the Duke of Wellington, seemed to consider that he was now brought in at the risk of the sacrifice of his high character, in the present dilemma in which the country was placed, to save it from what he considered might be a still greater misfortune. He must say it appeared to him, that the whole of this difficulty might easily have been avoided, unless there were other persons, of low, factious, intriguing natures, who interrupted the natural course of things. Were it not for such persons, these difficulties would never have arisen. When it was stated that the Bill, in the House of Lords, was not objected to upon any general principle, but upon a trivial point, he must say, that for any men to have taken up a trivial point, and to have acted upon it in a manner which had produced such consequences, was a course which did not appear to him deserving of any high commendation. His Majesty's Ministers being, as they were, men of high character, were bound to preserve that character, if not for the sake of their own honour, still for the benefit of the service to which they had been called, for even those who were opposed to his Majesty's late Ministers would admit, that the first duty of a Minister was, not to risk his public character. It was impossible for Lord Grey to have submitted to that vote, and ever again to have hoped to gain credit from the public for that high sense of honour and character which was so necessary to the situation in which he was placed. But what said the factious band in the House of Lords, who were willing to risk all consequences? They must be allowed to be either the most short-sighted, blind, and factious men that ever lived, or men willing to risk every thing but the interests for which they were standing up, which were peculiar to themselves, and in opposition to those of the country. The hon. Gentleman talked of the vote in the House of Lords having nothing to do with the principle of schedule A, and said, that the Lords had declared their willingness to adopt schedule A; but he said, that the vote declared the very contrary. He was sure the right hon. Baronet opposite would never hold that proposition, but would agree with him that the point was of the most material consequence, and was a main feature and principle of the Bill. How easily might all this have been avoided! With grief he said that the Duke of Wellington had agreed in that vote. He could not conceive how that noble Duke could have satisfied his mind, if he had looked forward to the state in which the country would be placed by that vote, and by which he supposed he was now led to the tardy conviction that the measure was necessary. He was far from imputing unworthy motives to the Duke of Wellington; but he must say, that a want of foresight was exhibited which could not entitle an individual to assume the direction of the country, under the difficult circumstances in which the country was placed. If the Duke of Wellington accepted of the office of Prime Minister, it would not be sufficient to say that he would pass this measure. There must be an investigation into the nature of the previous steps which had been taken. He was responsible to the House and to the country for all that had taken place previously to his taking office, and would be responsible for the advice which had been given to his Majesty, and for all that had passed. His Majesty could take no step unadvised. It was true the Constitution said, the Crown could dismiss a Minister, and appoint another, but as soon as that appointment took place, the Minister, by accepting office, became responsible to the public for all the consequences of the change. If that vote had never been come to, and if the House of Lords had allowed the Bill to pass, not only in the regular way, but in the way in which it was necessary the measure should be settled, namely, by beginning with schedule A, things would now be in a very different situation. As had been very properly said by the noble Lord below him, we might have avoided all inconveniences, if, at the time when the House of Lords were called upon to pass the Bill, they had withdrawn their opposition, instead of coming to the vote which had been the source of so much agitation and uneasiness. There would then have been no necessity for a creation of Peers, or for any change in the councils of his Majesty. The country would have been satisfied, and tranquillity and safety would have prevailed instead of discontent and excitement. Let Gentlemen consider what would be the state of the country if the acts of the Peers should interrupt the progress of the functions of the State. He had always maintained, and he was not inclined now to relinquish the opinion, that the old prerogative of the Crown, that of issuing writs to places which from their growing importance were entitled to representation, and not issuing them to decayed boroughs, was highly useful and necessary, and that, if it had been continued to be exercised, that House would not now be in the state in which it had got. That prerogative was now denied to the Crown. Some learned Gentlemen said that it was illegal, but how did they show that it was so? They said it had not been exercised for a long time. True. They said, that Committees of that House had reported their opinions that such a right ought not to be exercised by the Crown. But that did not take away the right if it belonged to the Crown. Where was the Statute, where was the Act of Parliament, which alone could defeat it? But supposing that disuse, or a general feeling of the country, admitted not of the prerogative being exercised, still, when some great measure was called for by the whole people, we had still a prerogative belonging to the Crown, and if a faction in the House of Lords left no other way to get out of the difficulty, could any man doubt that that prerogative must be exercised rather than throw the country into confusion and anarchy? But, amongst the intrigues which were carried on, one thing very much struck his mind: it was an extraordinary circumstance that a Judge of the land—a person filling a high judicial situation in the country—a criminal Judge—should mix himself up in political transactions. A Judge ought, by the nature and character of his office, to be totally removed from the sphere of politics; and yet this noble Lord, sitting upon the bench of justice in the morning, did not consider it inconsistent to engage in the strife of political projects in the evening. Supposing that a stranger were to come to England, and see the noble Lord administering justice in the morning; he would probably admire the dignity with which he filled his office, his calmness and freedom from passion with which he discharged his functions; but how much would he be surprised, on going to the House of Lords in the evening, to find the same noble Lord transformed to a violent political partisan, and heading a virulent faction?

Lord *Stormont* rose to Order, and objected to the terms in which the hon. Baronet spoke of the other branch of the Legislature. They owed to the House of Lords the same respect with which they would expect their proceedings to be treated elsewhere, and he considered that such expressions should not be further used as applied to the Peers. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair, if such language ought to be held in that House, if they wished to hold invulnerable their own privilege of being safe from attacks from the other House of Parliament?

The *Speaker* said, if the noble Lord appealed to him, the only answer he could give him was, that all the principles which ought to regulate the observations of Members of that House, with regard to each other, were equally applicable to the other House of Parliament. It was true, the hon. Baronet had merely put the case hypothetically. If he meant it strictly, and did not mean merely to draw a picture to illustrate his argument, he was sure he would see that it was not strictly regular. If he meant it to apply, he would not put it by a hypothesis, and then he would say, that what would be disorderly of that House, would be equally so if said of the other.

Sir *Francis Burdett* was not aware that he had committed any breach of Order. When he spoke of faction, he did not impute it to the House of Lords in general. There might be factions in the House of Commons, and he heard it perpetually charged against parties in that House. The charge did not affect the House as a body. The House was liable to that malady, if he might so call it. He trusted he was not trenching on the privileges of the House of Lords, if he said, that there might be factious motives there as well as in the House of Commons.

The *Speaker* again rose, and said, that such language might have been used in the warmth of debate, but it was impossible for any one to say, that because an irregularity was not checked at the time when it occurred, it therefore ceased to be an irregularity. The hon. Baronet must be aware that to impute personal motives was disorderly. The hon. Baronet would pardon him for this interruption. He had hoped that the matter would have passed without that notice which gave it a more serious character than, he was sure, the hon. Baronet intended it should have.

Sir *Francis Burdett* said, he had been endeavouring all through to avoid showing any warmth on this occasion. He had put a hypothetical case, with regard to the functions of one of the branches of the Constitution being impeded by another. He was speaking of the conduct of a Judge filling a high situation. He was observing, that amongst the other misfortunes brought about by intriguers—he did not know by whom in particular, but by those who had undermined the King's late Ministers—it was a misfortune that a person, who ought to be free from such transactions, and, in short, from politics altogether—a person who was a criminal Judge, who filled a high situation, was the leader—he might not say of a faction, but of an opposition to the Government of the country—was the maker and unmaker of Administrations—a person whom one saw everywhere—who, under his Judge's robes, seemed to wear a harlequin's habit—one who acted so many different parts, not in seven ages, but in seven hours—

> "In short he was
> A man so various that he seem'd to be
> Not one, but all mankind's epitome"—

who was doing everything, and who, it was said, expected the highest judicial situation in the country. That, he said, was a misfortune, and was to be deplored, and he spoke it without any warmth of temper. There seemed to be a rumour of some miscreated thing, "scarce half made up," but in that House he looked for information in vain. If anything were to happen, he did not know any one to whom the King could look for advice. He did not know any one to whom the King could look to preserve the peace, or to give orders. The unreasonable Opposition Peers were now, he believed, frightened at the condition in which they saw the country placed, in consequence of their vote. The underminers found themselves undermined, and he would say, in the language of the poet—

> "'Tis sport to have the engineer
> Hoist with his own petard."

The Opposition, in endeavouring to undermine others, were themselves undermined. For that House, it was their duty to see how the present difficulties could be got over, and how the affairs of the State could be placed in the only hands to which they could be confided with the public confidence, and how things might fall again into their natural course, when that House and his Majesty, and the other House of Parliament, would be called upon to do nothing else than simply to pass what, he said, would be a remedy for all the evils, and by objecting to which, on frivolous pretences, the Opposition in the House of Lords had thrown the country into its present unfortunate condition. How these things were to be brought about he was sure he knew not; but he was full of reliance upon the moderation of the country, and the wisdom of the people. He knew, at the same time, that a spirit was roused in England, which he assured the House it would be impossible to allay without satisfying the just and reasonable demands of the people. He saw no other way for that House to proceed than to adopt an Address to his Majesty, praying him to restore to his confidence and to public situations, those persons who, without any fault of theirs, were separated, but, he trusted, not disunited, from the country—who had been removed without fault or complaint on any side, but, at all events, without any fault on their part; and he trusted and hoped that the country would be again placed in a situation in which it could look to a speedy and happy termination of its present difficulties. A noble Lord, according to the member for Thetford (Mr. Baring), had declared, that the Lords would have passed schedule A without change or amendment. That might be so, but then their Lordships took good care not to let Earl Grey into that secret, and, therefore, his Lordship had no course left except that which he had adopted. He agreed, indeed, with the noble Earl, that it was the main and fundamental principle of the Bill, and that, after the declaration of the noble and learned Lord, in moving the Amendment, that he wished to enfranchise first, and to disfranchise only according to the extent to which it might be found necessary afterwards, he thought the noble Earl was justified in considering the division as deciding against the principle of the Bill. He thought it would become the Duke of Wellington much more if, instead of getting together a Cabinet to carry the same Bill, and then, as it was reported, resigning immediately afterwards, he used his influence with the House of Peers to induce them to pass the Bill under the auspices of the Minister who had first proposed it to them. If he did so, he would have the gratification of seeing the Constitution again an object of veneration to the people, and the Monarch restored to the affections of his subjects.

Mr. *Hume* said, he had never felt greater anxiety to address a few words to the House, than on the present occasion. He could not disguise the alarm he felt at the consequences which he foresaw from the events of the last eight days. He did not speak merely politically, but commercially, and with a view to every social tie in the country. He was glad to perceive a dawn or chance of reconciliation. He could not conceive a greater blessing to the country at the present moment, than anything which would furnish a means of restoring peace and quieting the agitation which pervaded the remotest quarters of the kingdom—the consequences of which no man could contemplate without dread. He, therefore, hoped, that what had fallen from the hon. member for Thetford to-night would not be lost sight of; and he declared, for his own part, that no phrase which could possibly produce irritation should fall from him, while there was a gleam of hope of bringing back affairs to a state in which they might be productive of peace, satisfaction, and contentment, to the country. He was sure that Earl Grey and his colleagues had too much at heart the object which had occupied their anxious attention for the last eighteen months, to think that they would for a moment object to an arrangement which would restore them to the confidence of his Majesty, and enable them to carry the great measure upon which they had so long laboured. From them he was sure there would be no objection; and, after what had been said by the hon. member for the University of Oxford (Sir Robert Inglis) and the hon. member for Thetford, it was impossible to think, that there would be any objection on the part of the Duke of Wellington, and those who acted with him, to retrace the steps which they had taken, he was sure, from being thoughtlessly advised. If his Majesty was anxious, as he was sure he was, to fulfil those determinations which had placed him so high in the estimation and the respect and affection of his people, he could not suppose that he would, upon any principle of etiquette or form, be unwilling to afford the means of quieting the country, and settling the agitation which prevailed. He trusted, therefore, that all parties would join in this feeling, who were anxious to see good feeling restored amongst those who alone could complete this great measure to the satisfaction of the country, as well as to their own honour, and to that of the Duke of Wellington himself, who would thus have the merit of making a sacrifice for the public good. After what had passed, he hoped the House might adjourn, leaving matters to their own operation, and trusting that the country would be saved from the danger which otherwise threatened it. He was the more anxious that such an arrangement should be made, because every post brought with it remonstrances and expressions of impatience. He was desirous, therefore, that no time should be lost, but that the first post from London should convey the happy news to the remotest parts of the empire. He hoped in this he did no more than speak the sentiments of the 288 who voted the other evening. If so, he hoped that the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Thetford were shared by those around him. Under the circumstances, he should be happy if, after disposing of the petition, the House adjourned, leaving it to the mutual good feeling of the parties to bring matters into their ordinary course, by which they might steer clear of mischiefs incalculable, and evils which every man must wish to avoid.

Lord *Morpeth* rose to second and support this recommendation. He was confident it would have the effect of arresting the course of evils, and to restore that just confidence in the Crown and the Government, which but a week ago they so fully possessed. All who lent themselves to this great work, would deserve the blessings of their countrymen.

Mr. *Labouchere* would add his voice to the same recommendation. There was no reflecting man who would not hear with joy of the glimmering of a hope of some termination to that state of things which all viewed with apprehension. Public men should, under such circumstances, bury all animosities, for the purpose of enabling Earl Grey to carry that Bill which all were now agreed should be carried, and which, if carried by any other hands, would not, in all probability, be received as a measure of peace or conciliation, which, by God's blessing, it was hoped it would have been; but, on the contrary, would lead to fresh animosities, and a restless desire of new changes, which every friend of his country must contemplate with the greatest dread. He trusted, therefore, that the independent Members of that House would use their just influence; and that those who had been Ministers, and those who expected to be Ministers, would, under the circumstances, abandon their intentions, and save the country from the three perils that threatened it: first, that the Reform Bill would not prove satisfactory to the people; next, that the character of all public men might escape the stain which would fall on it if those who had always opposed the Bill now carried it into a law; and, lastly, that the character of the Sovereign might not any longer suffer in the opinions of his people. The course now recommended would restore that Sovereign to their affections, which he believed none ever better deserved, and every true friend to the monarchy must desire to see that restoration take place as speedily as possible.

Lord *Althorp* said, in consequence of what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman who spoke last, as well as from the members for Yorkshire and Middlesex (Lord Morpeth and Mr. Hume) he wished to recall the attention of those hon. Members and of the House who seemed to indulge in so many anticipations of good, to the real state of the question. Those who indulged in anticipations of the possibility of a compromise between parties should recollect what was the real state of public affairs. At the present moment, as they had heard that night from a right hon. Gentleman, doubtless well informed on the subject, the new Administration was completely formed in all its most essential points. The proposition, as far as he understood it, was, that in consequence of the discussions which had taken place in that House, it was to be expected that some arrangement might take place, and that the House of Lords would withdraw their opposition to the Bill. Now, in his humble opinion, there was nothing more unlikely. He thought it was as unlikely a thing as any he had ever heard, that the Lords would withdraw their opposition to the Bill as it now stood, and that hon. Gentlemen were indulging in unfounded expectations. He believed the Reform Bill would be carried, and he was satisfied it would pass the House of Lords; but he did not believe, that in the present state of the House of Lords, it was possible for the late Administration to carry such a Bill. He rose to say this, because, when he found Members so sanguine in their calculations of an accommodation, he wished to recall their attention to the real circumstances in which they were placed, and to ask them, if they looked back to the events which had already taken place, what probability there was, that the House of Lords would allow the late Administration to carry the Reform Bill?

Lord *Sandon* regretted as much as any man the events which had taken place, but he believed it would be found they arose wholly, in the House of Lords, from a misapprehension of the nature of the arguments, and a misunderstanding of the intentions of the Opposition—he believed this on his honour. He believed on his honour and conscience, that the motives of the opponents of the Government had been misunderstood—that having the Bill before them, it was their desire to make it as perfect as possible; and that they would have sent it back to that House in such a shape as that House would have gladly accepted it in. He believed, too, that this Bill would have been most satisfactory to the country. He cordially concurred in the observations of the hon. Member with respect to the necessity of preserving the character of public men free from taint; and he hoped, therefore, that a reconciliation might yet take place, and that all the difficulties at present in the way might be successfully overcome.

Mr. *Denison* was disposed to think the vote of the other evening rather premature; but, after what had already taken place, and after what he had heard that night, he thought it the duty of every independent Member to concur in the recommendation that the contending parties should endeavour to effect a reconciliation.

Mr. *Hunt* thought it necessary to say a few words, although he was not one of the 288 who voted for Ministers; and the reason for that was, he did not wish to mix himself up with either party. He agreed with those hon. Members who asserted that the country was in such a state that there were very few persons, either in that or in the other House of Parliament, who could restore it to peace and good humour. Nor would he disguise the fact, that the only persons who were at all likely to succeed in tranquillizing the people, were the late Government. Whether they really could do so or not he did not know; but this he knew, that whatever was done must be done promptly; that it must be done without intermission or delay—otherwise, he would defy any man to say what might happen in the course of eight-and-forty hours. He had listened to the hon. member for Westminster, as he had often done before, with great pleasure. That hon. Baronet had spoken very justly of the impropriety of the interference of a criminal Judge in political intrigues. But he begged leave, for fair play was a jewel, to recal to the hon. Baronet and the Whigs a circumstance which occurred some years ago. He remembered that when Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville were in power, Lord Ellenborough, a criminal Judge, had a seat in the Cabinet; so that the same man might one day determine on the prosecution of any person, and the next day sit in judgment on him. He was certainly of opinion, that at all times Judges should attend to the bench, and not meddle with politics. They had heard a great deal about political immorality and political consistency; and he was certainly ready to admit, that should the Duke of Wellington, after the strenuous opposition which he had given to the Reform Bill, and after the protest which he had a few days ago made against it, now take office for the purpose of carrying the Bill, there would be a great deal of political inconsistency, and perhaps of political immorality in his so doing. He could not forget, however, that the Gentlemen paid an equal disregard to political consistency when they joined the Administration of Mr. Canning, the determined foe of Parliamentary Reform. In truth, as regarded either Whigs or Tories in such points, if they were all put into one bag, and shaken together, it would be difficult to say who would come out first. Though he could not, the other night, vote that Ministers were entitled to his unabated confidence, he had now no hesitation in saying, that from one end of the country to the other the feelings of the people were so worked up, and so excited, that no Administration could possibly be found, except the late Ministry, calculated to satisfy and tranquillize the country. If any man had been that day at the Bank of England, as he (Mr. Hunt) had been, he would have seen a state of things that should be known to the House. He had been four or five times in one day at the Bank, during the panic in 1825, and the run then was not to be compared to what had passed at the Bank that day. He was detained full three-quarters of an hour that day at the Bank of England before he could get a 10*l.* note changed. There were placards stuck up in the city advising the people, should the Duke of Wellington come into power, to go for gold to the Bank; and a banker of eminence in London had openly that day expressed his approbation of such advice. What then would be the situation of London in forty-eight hours if such a state of things should be allowed to continue, and if that which had just occurred in the House should not have the effect which it was hoped it would have, on its going forth, of tranquillizing the public mind? Whenever his Majesty's Ministers were in his opinion wrong, he had fearlessly opposed them; but this he did know, that if they were not to continue in office, the House would have petitions from all parts of the country, like the petition coming from Bristol, calling for a still larger measure of Reform; and he was quite certain that the people would not be satisfied with any Reform but from the hands of his Majesty's present Government. He was not disposed to interfere, in the slightest degree, with that conciliatory spirit which it was hoped would bring about such a state of things, but this he would repeat as his solemn conviction that there was no safety for the country unless in Earl Grey and his Majesty's Ministers carrying the Reform Bill.

Mr. *O'Connell* expressed the satisfaction with which he should see a reconciliation between the Crown and the late Ministry; convinced as he was, that in that reconciliation alone could be found the means of tranquillizing the people and securing the Throne. He concurred in almost everything which had fallen from the noble member for Liverpool, and especially in the result; namely that, whoever could replace us in the situation in which we were a week ago, would be a most bountiful benefactor to his country. The spirit of revolution was abroad; and if it were allowed to pass a certain stage, it would be difficult to check it. Like the pestilence with which the country had lately been visited, if it were not arrested at an early stage, cure might be impossible. At present there was still hope that means might be found to heal the body politic. Let but a little time elapse and he would be a bold man who would predict the event. Hundreds of thousands and millions of persons depended for their subsistence on the regular working of society; on receiving wages; on being employed. Let but the present state of things continue for a few days, and they must either starve, or do mischief. Let but a single week elapse, and revolution and the utter destruction of the beautiful fabric around us might be the consequence. And if this danger existed in England, was there no other part of the empire in danger? Did the House think that a change of Administration, which would give power in Ireland to those who did not possess it at present, might not be productive of frightful events, especially if that change were accompanied by disturbances in this country? We were in such a state, that every wise and good man must wish it to be speedily changed. Even those who formerly opposed Reform, on the ground that it led to undefinable change, now that the Radicals (of whom he professed himself to be one) pledged themselves to the late Administration, that if the proposed measure were passed, they would give it a fair trial as an experiment, must be disposed to yield the point. They were so pledged to the late Administration, but they were not so pledged to an Administration which might be formed by the Duke of Wellington. Let those, therefore, who desired to see the present change a final one, and who wished to stop the progress of a revolutionary spirit, endeavour to do so by restoring the late Government to office. He trusted that the temper manifested by that House to-night would have such a happy effect. They should not adjourn over to-morrow, and he hoped that, even by that time, the sense and feeling evinced by that House would have such an effect. To accomplish it, he, for one, would not stop at any thing short of a sacrifice of principle. He wished to see Reform instead of revolution; he wished to see the people's rights secured, and no one could be more anxious than he was, to see the security of the Throne firmly established upon the affections and the good will of the nation.

Mr. *Fysche Palmer* said, he had just come from attending a county meeting, and that so strong was the feeling there expressed for the restoration of Earl Grey and his colleagues to power, that the meeting resolved, if such an event should not take place, to abstain from the use of spirits, and of all exciseable commodities, and instruct their Representatives to withhold the Supplies until the Reform Bill should be passed. Such was the feeling which was abroad throughout the country. He understood that the same feeling was general along the line of road on which he travelled to town. A meeting was to be held this day in Bradford, and there were similar meetings about to be held immediately all over that part of the country. The general impression in the country was, that there had been a juggle, and that Lord Grey had been cajoled. From his own personal observations, from all that he had seen and all that he had heard, he would say, that there was at the present moment an excitement throughout the country which must be allayed soon, or it would burst out into a species of violence that he would not take upon him to describe. He concurred with the hon. member for Middlesex, that some arrangement should be at once made for the restoration of his Majesty's Ministers to power. Perhaps, in order to allow such an arrangement to be effected, they should adjourn for a few days. The people now placed their sole confidence in that House. Ever since the vote of Thursday last they knew that the House had done its duty, and he had never heard more confidence expressed in that House than he had heard that day; and he must add, that it had never been better deserved by it.

Mr. Alderman *Venables* said, that he would not go into the general subject adverted to in the petition; but he would take this opportunity, in supporting the petition, to express his sentiments. He quite concurred in the recommendation thrown out by the hon. member for Middlesex, and he hoped that it came not too late to have a good effect. When there were so many individuals in this country who had the means of easy access to the Sovereign, he trusted that some of them would carry that advice to the King, and show to his Majesty, that it was necessary for the peace of the country that his late Ministers should be restored to office. If, in the present state of public affairs, the Reform Bill should not be carried, it was his solemn conviction that the country would be torn to pieces from one end to the other; and if the Duke of Wellington and a Tory Government should, after so long opposing the Bill, at length on getting into office, carry it, their doing so would be such a dereliction of all public principle as to be productive of as much evil as the Reform Bill might be expected to produce good. The country would have no confidence in the measure coming from such a Government, and, instead of producing good, the only effect it would have would be, to accelerate the separation of power from property, and to end in revolution. He trusted that the Sovereign would attend to the wise recommendation of that House. If he should not, and if a crisis should arise, then he would be prepared to support the proposition put forward in the petition.

Mr. *Davies Gilbert* wished to address a few words to the House on this occasion. He had certainly voted against the second reading of the Bill, and he had taken other opportunities to oppose it in the former Session. He had also voted against the Bill in one of its stages in the present Session, and he had voted against the metropolitan clause; but then, seeing that the opinion of the country was decidedly for the measure, he had not since voted against it. It seemed to be admitted by all parties, in the course of this discussion, that the Bill must infallibly pass. If the Duke of Wellington should take office, even after his opposition to the Bill, and after his recent protest against it, his friends were constrained to acknowledge that he must pass the measure. If that was the case, and if the Duke of Wellington could take office upon no other ground, then it appeared to him perfectly absurd that the present Ministry, who had brought in the Bill, should not also have the passing of it. In that case, he hoped to see those Ministers restored to office for the purpose of carrying the Bill; indeed the Members of the House of Peers themselves must see that there was no other alternative left for the prosperity and the peace of the country but the carrying of the Bill. He begged pardon for thus obtruding himself on the House. Though a Member of it for thirty years, he was not in the habit of taking up much of its time, but seeing how the public feeling now ran, he conceived it to be the duty of every independent Member (and he believed he might reckon himself as one), to stand forward and declare his sentiments. He begged and entreated every independent Member to do so. He belonged to no party. He had frequently refused office under Government, and he, therefore, had a right to claim the title of an independent Member of Parliament. As such he now addressed the House. It was admitted on all hands that the Bill must pass, in order to avert the danger of a revolution, and that being the case, was it not better to pass it in a way so as to conciliate the nation, to establish peace, and to avoid all chance of a civil war? He, therefore, would earnestly entreat Gentlemen in that House to join together for the good of the country, and, as far as he could see, the straightest line for effecting that object consisted in restoring to office that Administration which had originally brought in the Bill, and which had so strenuously supported it up to the present moment.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, that without altering his opinions as to the Bill, he most decidedly concurred in the sentiment, that, as the Bill must pass, it should be passed by those Ministers who had introduced it; that it was but just that they should reap the glory and advantage of the measure, if it should prove beneficial to the country, and that if, on the contrary, it should be productive of evil consequences, the censure should alone fall on their heads. He could fancy no ground that could compel any individuals to give up their feelings and opinions, as those who, it was said, proposed to form his Majesty's Government must do, except a deep sense of the incalculable wound which the Constitution must suffer from the adoption of that advice which the late Ministers were said to have tendered to the Sovereign. The fear of such an irreparable wound being inflicted on the independence and constitution of the House of Lords, thus throwing it at the mercy of an ambitious Minister, and of an overbearing House of

Commons, might induce individuals to sacrifice their opinions to avert such a calamity, and to form an Administration, therefore, to carry a measure which they had all opposed. But they were not threatened with such a calamity at present, and that, therefore, rendered it very desirable that the conduct of this measure should remain in the hands of those who had brought it in, and who had staked their characters upon it.

Lord *Ingestrie* could not see how the unfortunate differences to which allusion had been made could be brought to a conclusion by the prolongation of this discussion this night. He thought, that in order to afford time for something to be done to satisfy the country, the House should adjourn over to-morrow to Thursday ["*no.*"] He was of opinion, after the discussion which had just taken place, in order to allow the arrangements which might be desirable to be effected, that that they should adjourn over to-morrow. ["*No, no.*"]

Mr. *Lennard* was anxious to join his voice to that of the other Members who had spoken on this subject. He was competent to state to the House what was the feeling of a large body of persons on the subject in the county of Essex. He sincerely believed that the country had nothing more at heart than that the Bill should remain in the hands of Earl Grey and his colleagues. He had in his possession a petition to that effect from a large town in the county of Essex, and he had that morning received letters from various parts of that county, insisting on the necessity of maintaining Earl Grey and his colleagues in office. The country, he was certain, had nothing more at heart, next to the passing of the Reform Bill, than that Earl Grey should remain in power. The Reform Bill would be received as a boon from a popular Administration; but if it were extorted from an unpopular Government, it would not be received as a boon; it would not allay the popular excitement, nor would it produce general satisfaction and contentment. He trusted that the clear expression of the sense of that House that night would have the effect that was to be desired from it. He trusted, that after the manifestation of feeling that had taken place on both sides of the House, the breach which had occurred between the King and his Ministers would be healed up, and that the Reform Bill would be carried through the House of Lords by the original introducers of it. He was, indeed, very sanguine in his expectations that that might be the case; and if, by the interference of the Duke of Wellington, the Bill could be again placed under the conduct of its authors, the Duke would acquire fresh claims to the gratitude of his country.

Colonel *Sibthorp* belonged to no party or Administration, but acted and voted in perfect independence. Until he heard it from much higher authority than that by which the allegation had hitherto been made, he would not believe that the means proposed to carry the Reform Bill had ever received the Royal sanction. At present, however, there was no responsible person in the House from whom information could be obtained. Adverting to what had fallen from the hon. member for Preston, he denied that there was any such run upon the Bank as that hon. Gentleman had described. He had no fears upon that head. Nor had he any apprehensions with respect to the people, who were loyal and well-affected, except when they were deluded by false statements. Of this he was convinced, that the last Administration was one of the most incompetent that had ever held the reins of power in this country; and nothing could be more criminal than their holding out to the people the expectation that the Reform Bill would be the panacea for all the evils which they endured.

Mr. *Wellesley* said, that this House ought to sit day by day till they knew that there was a responsible Government. He must say, that he had had doubts, and he still had doubts, as to there being any Government in existence at that moment, and, therefore, he wished that House to sit till there should be a Government able to acquaint them and the country with the facts of the various rumours that had been spread about. He said this, because he wished his constituents to know that nothing would deter him from doing his duty. He should receive in forty-eight hours a petition from his constituency to that House, which would enable him to go into that great question, whether they were to have the Duke of Wellington at the head of a Reform Government. During his connexion with Essex, he had never known any event that had made so great a sensation as the statement that the

Duke of Wellington was again in office. If he (Mr. Wellesley) were actuated by personal feelings alone, he should speak against the late Government; but he was not, and indeed he thought that the best friends of the Duke of Wellington would be those who most strongly advised him to pause before he took the Government of the country under present circumstances. He could assure them that on that subject the feeling of the county of Essex was strong, and that the feelings of the Tories were more strong than even those of the Whigs. There was no man who had the blood of the Duke of Wellington in his veins who would not say that the Duke of Wellington would not stain his honour if he took office under present circumstances. The Duke of Wellington was but a man; but he trusted that the Duke would not fall into that feebleness of mind, sometimes the unhappy lot of great men, and be again deluded as before in doing that which would lower his estimation among the people.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson*, in reference to what the hon. member for Preston had stated with regard to the run on the Bank, observed, that the calls made on the Bank had not been by any means equal to the amount which the Bank was frequently called on to pay. It was true, that for the last three or four days a considerable number of persons had gone there with 5*l.* and 10*l.* notes to get them cashed, but that if it was supposed that the demand for gold was to be compared with that which took place in 1825, it was perfectly erroneous. The Bank Directors had no apprehension of inconvenience, much more of the safety and security of the establishment being endangered.

Mr. *Hunt*, in explanation, repeated, that he had been kept there three-quarters of an hour in getting a 10*l.* note changed.

Mr. *John Campbell* proposed that the House should adjourn to Thursday. By that time his Majesty's Answer to the Address of that House would have arrived, and he hoped that answer would be, that, in accordance with the wishes of that House, his Majesty had restored his late Ministers to his Councils.

Mr. *Hodges* opposed adjourning over to-morrow.

Mr. *Curteis* was also opposed to it. He had received, by express, a petition from Brighton, agreed to at a very large and respectable meeting there held this day. That petition vowed the most determined hostility to every Government opposed to Reform.

Sir *Charles Burrell* was opposed to adjourning over to-morrow. He thought that the difficulties in the way of carrying the Reform Bill were smoothed down; for the chief difficulty was in the necessity for the creation of Peers, and that difficulty now appeared, from the declarations made on the other side of the House, to be removed, since it seemed from them that the Government now about to be formed were no longer opposed to the Bill.

Mr. *Dominic Brown* objected to adjourning over to-morrow. The state of Ireland imperiously called on the Duke of Wellington to give, when out of office, the same support to the Reform Bill which it appeared, from the declarations of the other side, he intended to give it when he came into power. Such conduct would show him to be the best friend of his country.

Mr. *Praed* had not understood any declaration to have been made by that side of the House, that they understood the temper of the House of Lords to be, that they were prepared to pass the whole Reform Bill, or to give up that freedom which, if it did not belong to the deliberations of the House of Peers, that House was, in his opinion, worse than useless. What he had heard was, that the House of Lords were likely to agree to the leading principles of the Bill. That had been said over and over again, and long before that vote on which the late Ministry had thought fit to retire from Office.

Petition read and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Tuesday, May 15, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Lord DURHAM, from Stirling, in favour of Parliamentary Reform.—By the Marquis of CLANRICARDE, from Relclare, and other Places in Ireland, in favour of the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland.)

MINISTERIAL PLAN OF EDUCATION (IRELAND).] The Bishop of Kilmore presented a Petition from the clergy of his diocese, against the National Education System in Ireland.

Lord *King* was convinced, that after the present week, they would hear no more of these anti-national education petitions, as they were part of a conspiracy, based in political fraud and delusion, against Earl

Grey's Administration; the main plot of which, he was happy to say, had wholly failed. The Pharisaic originators of those petitions had not stopped at what he supposed he must call pious frauds, in order to array the best feelings of the religious portion of the community against the present Government. They told the people, that the main object of Ministers in introducing the national education system into Ireland was, to "deprive the Protestant children of their right to peruse the Sacred Volume," though they well knew that, so far from that being the fact, not less than two days each week were wholly devoted to scriptural instruction and unrestricted scriptural reading.

The Earl of *Roden* denied that the opposition of the clergy, and other well-meaning individuals, to the Irish national education system had any political origin. There was nothing like a plot against the Government, and the petitions would, he believed, be yet more numerous than at present, consequent upon a conviction, sanctioned by God's word, that that system was Anti-Christian in principle, inasmuch as it went to mutilate the Holy Volume. The opposition solely arose from a feeling on the part of the people of England against what they considered an unscriptural and unchristian system of education.

Lord *King* believed, that there was something political in the opposition, and that it did not arise altogether from such worthy motives as the noble Earl set up on behalf of all the petitioners who came before the House. But, some how or other, it was a curious phenomenon in the proceedings of the "saints," that though their spiritual visions were, it must be presumed, ever fixed upon the "kingdom come," they seemed also to have an eye upon this "sublunary world below." In opposing, for instance, what the noble Earl designated the Anti-Christian education system of the Whigs, they contrived to make the opposition auxiliary—impotently so, he was happy to find—to the restoration of the Tories.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* agreed with his noble friend (the Earl of Roden), when he stated that these petitions had not originated in political feeling. He denied, too, that the House would hear no more of these petitions after this week. A feeling upon this question, of a nature far more powerful than that which prevailed upon the Catholic Question, would be excited throughout the country. It was the duty of a Christian Legislature, in a Christian country, to connect that religion which they believed to be the pure religion with the education of the people. In the attempt, therefore, to bring that Legislature to a sense of their sacred duty, there was nothing of political hostility—nothing of a worldly character; and, for one, he never would cease from bringing the question in its true light before the people of England, and before that House. As for the unbecoming sneer of the noble Baron, respecting the views and feelings of those he was pleased to style "saints," he would only observe, that that noble Baron never possessed, and was incapable of appreciating the feelings of such persons. That noble Baron never spoke upon any sacred subject, except in such a tone as must excite the scorn and indignation of every Christian man. The noble Earl, with great energy, said he would repeat the words—the scorn and indignation of every Christian man.

Lord *King* said, the noble Earl had no right to assume, that because he had over and over denounced the abuses of the Church Establishment and the tithe system, that he was, therefore, unmindful or indifferent to the uses of religion. But this was ever the way with the monopolists of religion: venture to question the immaculate perfection of the tithe system, or the holding of Church pluralities, or the advantages of overpaying a Bishop for doing little, while the working clergy hardly obtained the means of subsistence, and, as a matter of course, you are denounced as the enemy of every thing sacred and orthodox. He defied the noble Earl to cite a single expression of his whole life at all reflecting upon religion, apart from its abuses.

Petition laid on the Table.

MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENTS.] Earl *Grey:* As there is no other important business before your Lordships, I move that this House do adjourn over till Thursday. I do so in consequence of a communication which I have this day had from his Majesty.

Lord *Kenyon* wished to know whether the House and the public were to understand from the noble Earl's declaration, that he and his colleagues were to be restored to their official stations?

Earl *Grey* was sure that the House would see, that it would be indiscreet in him to offer any further explanation, under the circumstances in which he then stood. He had stated that he had had a communication from his Majesty: of course their Lordships understood that that communication could only refer to the affairs of the State, so far as they were affected by the resignation of himself and his colleagues. It had, besides, been made to him so recently, that it would be impossible to afford further information, or to say more than this, that nothing decisive had ensued, and that it was not in his power to state what it was plain the noble Baron was so anxious to extort—namely, that it was decided that the present Government should retain office. He was not then authorized to state more, and therefore proposed that they should adjourn over to-morrow, in order to afford time for the completion of some arrangements.

Lord *Kenyon* was quite satisfied with the noble Earl's second statement, and felt it would be unreasonable, in the present stage of the proceedings, to press him further.

Earl *Grey* was persuaded that his first explanation was to the full as explicit as his second—both amounting only to this —that he had had a communication from his Majesty, which had as yet led to no decided consequences.

The *Lord Chancellor* rose to prevent any misunderstanding on the part of the noble Baron (Kenyon) as to there being any difference between his noble friend's first and second explanations, and to prevent a repetition of such irregular questions as that put by him to his noble friend. It was highly irregular to ask a Minister the precise character of any confidential communication which he might have had from his Sovereign; and though his noble friends and colleagues had tendered a resignation of their respective offices to his Majesty, which his Majesty had been graciously pleased to accept, still he stood there as a servant of the Crown, to whom all communications from the Crown must necessarily be confidential. His noble friend, therefore, was not at liberty to state more than the fact that he had had a communication from his Majesty; and he was at a loss to know by what subtilty of interpretation the noble Baron could persuade himself that he had obtained more information from the second explanation of his noble friend than from the first. He had listened attentively to both, and could state, that if he knew no more of the communication than it was fair to presume the noble Baron and the House generally knew, he should not have been better acquainted with its purport by the second statement than by the first statement of his noble friend; and he was convinced that the first simple declaration, that he had had a communication from the Crown, derived no increase of strength or explicitness from the second. As his noble friend had stated, every noble Lord must have understood the communication to refer to the state of public affairs. Further than this it would be improper to state—that it had led to no positive consequences, and might have no consequences.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* differed from the noble and learned Lord as to the perfect identity of the noble Earl's two statements. This important fact was elicited from the second explanation, which the first by no means imported—namely, that it was by no means a decided consequence of the King's communication that the noble Earl and his colleagues would be restored to office.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned to Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, May 15, 1832.

Minutes. New Writ ordered. In the room of Lord Tufton, now Earl of Thanet, for Appleby.

Bills. Read a second time. On the Motion of Lord Duncannon, Crown Lands (Ireland.)—Committed. On the Motion of Mr. Cutlar Fergusson, Juries (India); and Insolvent Debtors (India.)

Public Feeling—the Ministry.] Mr. Alderman *Waithman* presented a Petition from the parish of St. Bride, in favour of the Reform Bill, and which also prayed that the House would withhold Supplies until that Bill was passed into a law. He took advantage of that opportunity to allude to a matter which had occurred last Sunday at St. Bride's Church. A charity sermon was to be preached there by the Bishop of Litchfield, and he was sorry to say, that he understood a great deal of disorder and much improper behaviour had occurred. As that had been imputed to the cause of Reform, he begged to say, that the imputation, so far as the parishioners (who were all Reformers) were concerned, was utterly without foundation. None of the parishioners had any share whatever in it. A great part of the rioters were boys, and a person who had been taken into custody was not only not an inhabitant of the parish, but he was not an inhabitant of the ty.

Mr. *Lyttleton* expressed the greatest satisfaction at the statement just made by the hon. Alderman, in vindication of his constituents from the charge of having made this shameful attack on the Bishop of Litchfield. He (Mr. Lyttleton) lived in the diocese of that right rev. Prelate, and he could positively assert, that no man was more distinguished for charity, liberality, and munificence, than was the Bishop of Litchfield, who was also a model of unaffected piety. There was not an individual in the House of Lords of the right rev. Prelate's Order, who was less disposed to be guilty of political intrigue, or who valued his seat in that House less than he did for the political power it conferred. He did not believe there was a better man on the face of the earth.

Mr. *Hume* was anxious to state his opinion, that the course taken by the Journals, and by some persons out of doors, on this subject was extremely improper. If the persons who committed this outrage were Reformers, they had disgraced themselves, and those who wished to see the institutions of the country renovated ought not to countenance the manner in which the Bishop had been treated. At the same time he was bound to say, that some allowance ought to be made for those who possessed feelings as warm as his own on the subject of Reform, and who had not the same means that he had of expressing those feelings. He hoped that what had now been said would prevent the recurrence of such scenes in future.

Sir *Edward Sugden* thought, that when the hon. member for Middlesex was speaking on the subject he ought to have gone a little further, and to have advised, not only people to abstain from such outrages, but Gentlemen from using that inflammatory language which led to these outrages. If Gentlemen would point out the means by which the spirit of the law could be violated while its letter was adhered to, of course the people would follow those means, and the fault was, if possible, greater in the one than in the other.

Mr. *Harvey* said, it might be consistent with the principles and wishes of the hon. and learned Gentleman to express a hope that Gentlemen would abstain from expressing their opinions, but he also ought to go further than he had done, and call on certain other people to abstain from acting in a manner calculated to inflame the temper of the people. A great deal was required before their temper became inflamed, for this contest showed the good temper they possessed, and he had no hesitation in asserting, that but for the acts to which he had alluded, whatever might be the language of demagogues, however they might desire and attempt to stir up the people, they would desire and attempt in vain. It was because the people had had so much real ground for anger, that any of them had been led, in a hasty moment, to trespass over the peaceful threshold of propriety. But, while he agreed with all that hon. Members had said in expressing their hopes that such conduct should never be repeated, he must be allowed to say, that he trusted this example of what people might be driven to would not be without its effects. If the right rev. Prelate merited, as there could be no doubt he did, the very high eulogium so warmly passed on him by the hon. member for Staffordshire, it was clear that what he had done to excite the ill-will of the people must be owing, not to himself, but to his political situation. The remedy for that was, to deprive the Spiritual Peers of their political power, and to put them into that situation in which, instead of being likely to draw down on themselves popular dislike, they would be able to afford in their conduct the example of what they preached, and to exhibit to the world no other picture but that of the spotless tendency of their lives.

Mr. *George Bankes* thought that all the observations of the hon. member for Colchester proceeded upon the mistaken assumption, that the congregation had risen against their pastor. Now, that supposition was at utter variance with the statement of the hon. Alderman. He did not think that many persons would be found to agree with the hon. Member, that the House of Peers should be diminished in the manner he proposed. He should take that opportunity of making a remark upon another subject—he was sorry that the hon. member for Middlesex, in postponing his motion for a Call of the House, should have said that he would not postpone it after to-morrow, unless that House had some information that Earl Grey was recalled to the Government. The hon. Member ought to have abstained from making such remarks, whatever might be his private feelings on the occasion.

Mr. *Gillon* was as anxious as any man for the purgation of the House of Lords, but he must say, that they disgraced the name of Reformers who had made the Church the scene of their insults to one of its dignified members.

Mr. Alderman *Hughes* took the opportunity which the presenting of this petition afforded him, to notice a report that had appeared in the papers, and that must have been furnished by some hon. Member, as the discussion took place before the doors were opened to strangers. The report he alluded to was, that on that part of the London Petition which related to the stopping of the Supplies, he had said he should vote against it. He had never said any such thing. What he had said was, that he feared a Resolution worded so generally as that which had been recommended, might bind them to refuse Supplies to any Government, and that in that manner, they might have pledged themselves to withhold Supplies from the Government that had brought in the Reform Bill.

Colonel *Davies* coincided with the prayer of the petition that had just been presented. He could assure those who had thought him lukewarm in the cause of Reform, that they were utterly mistaken; for the hesitation he had felt as to some parts of the Bill proceeded from a fear, that some of the details would not carry into effect the principles of it. If the Duke of Wellington had formed a Government hostile to the Bill, he for one should have been ready to withhold Supplies from that Government till a full and efficient measure of Reform had received the Royal Assent. He had been misunderstood the other day, when he was supposed to have said that he felt strong objections to the creation of Peers in order to carry that measure. To effect such an object, he should have been ready to assent to the creation of 100 Peers, had such a creation been necessary.

Petition laid on the Table, and to be printed.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* then presented a Petition from the town of Liverpool, which he had been honoured with through one of its Members, and which prayed, that whatever new Government might be formed, the House would refuse Supplies, not only till the Government had given a pledge to bring in a measure of Reform as extensive in every respect as that of Earl Grey's, but till that pledge had been fully redeemed.

Mr. *Ewart* expressed his obligations to the hon. Alderman for having presented this petition, and then declared his cordial concurrence with it. He begged to inform the House that it had been agreed to at the largest Reform Meeting ever held at Liverpool. The demand for Reform was not recent in that town. The first time he had stood a candidate there, he had been called on to pledge himself to advocate an extensive measure of Reform. The inhabitants of Liverpool never thought the franchise of their own town sufficiently extensive, and he expressed his opinion that, with a properly extended franchise, there would be a constituency of between 18,000 and 20,000 respectable voters.

Mr. *Hume* said, that every one was desirous that the agitation into which the country had been thrown should cease as speedily as possible, and, under that feeling he had stated, that if, when they met this day, he found such circumstances to exist as would ensure the success of the Reform Bill, he should not say one word that could possibly add to the already existing agitation. He had in his possession fourteen petitions, that had been agreed to at different meetings held within three hours after the news of the proceedings unfavourable to Reform had reached them. He should, with the view he had mentioned, withhold these petitions this day, and, the more especially as a report was abroad that Earl Grey had seen his Majesty. If that was true, he had some hope that a conciliation would take place, and he, therefore, suggested to hon. Members who, like himself, had petitions in favour of Reform, and for withholding Supplies, not to present them at present, in order not to increase the agitation which he believed it would be found had already produced its effect.

Sir *Edward Sugden* did not know whether the hon. member for Middlesex was to be considered the organ of the Government [" *No*," from Mr. *Hume*] which was now about to resume its place; but it was impossible to avoid remarking the tone of moderation which the hon. Member now assumed. When he thought he had every thing his own way, he could condescend to be amiable and kind; he would not embarrass the Government—he would not have his Majesty's name lightly treated—but when the question seemed likely to be decided the other way, how changed was his language. He was not one of those who found fault with the strong expression of strong feeling, and, therefore, he did not quarrel with it when employed by those who desired to support his Majesty's present Government; but he must say, that in the debates that had recently taken place, there had been a violence of deportment among some of the Members of that House, and some, too, of those who had filled seats in his Majesty's councils, which he thought did not become such persons. While they still enjoyed a share of his Majesty's favour, whilst his Majesty continued to be guided by Whig advisers, he was spoken of with every possible tenderness and respect, and they were his very loyal subjects; but he lost all their favour if he withdrew his countenance from them for a moment.

Mr. *Hume* should be sorry, on this occasion, to introduce anything with which his Majesty's name was connected. In what he had observed he only meant to say, that if there was an alteration in the Ministry, he was most anxious to calm that agitation which all knew to exist, and which the hon. and learned Gentleman seemed so much to desire should continue.

Mr. *Baring* rose to state, which he intended to have done at an earlier period, that the communications with the Duke of Wellington for the formation of a new Administration were entirely at an end. After having made that statement, he had no other observations to offer, but to express his ardent and sincere hope, that the state of things, to the administration of which the Government were about to return, would terminate in some arrangement for the benefit and for the peace of the country. Whether it was or not desirable for the Members to forbear further discussions till his Majesty's Government were prepared to make their communications to that House, he would not undertake to determine, nor would he say whether the recent nature of what had passed would enable them to do so at once; but he was sure the House would see how much any arrangements would be impeded by the continuance of those warm discussions. He wished to take that opportunity of correcting a misapprehension which an hon. Gentleman had last night fallen into, when he said that it was understood the Duke of Wellington had accepted office. He had not done so. Matters had not come to that point. He had only entered into communication with his Majesty as to certain measures that might be necessary under the peculiar circumstances of the moment.

Lord *Althorp* said, Sir, had not the hon. Gentleman anticipated me, it was my intention, as soon as I had taken my seat, to rise for the purpose of informing the House, that Earl Grey has received a communication from his Majesty this day, and, therefore, I intend to suggest to the House the propriety of adjourning over to-morrow, and I shall presently take an opportunity of moving that this House at its rising do adjourn over to-morrow. I entirely concur with what the hon. Gentleman has stated that it will be most desirable, under the present circumstances of the country, that hon. Gentlemen should abstain from continuing discussions, which, if they have any effect at all, will not have that of allaying the feelings of excitement that now exist.

Lord *Porchester* wished to be allowed to say, that what a noble relative of his had said in the other House of Parliament had been misapprehended. He had the authority of his noble relative for stating, that his noble relative had never said that a Government had been formed—the words he had used were, that the Government was in the act of formation.

Petition to be printed.

OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT—EXPLANATION.] Lord Althorp moved that this House at its rising do adjourn to Thursday next.

Mr. *Hume* wished, before the vote for the adjournment was agreed to, to take that opportunity of throwing out a suggestion of his own, which arose from the interruption they had already experienced to the attainment of their wishes, and from the excitement that had in consequence taken place. He trusted that whatever arrangement was now made would be a final arrangement, so that the people might be satisfied that this measure would be carried into effect. He said this, for he had for months been apprehensive of that which had now taken place, from the circumstance of individuals remaining in office who, he trusted, would now no longer be allowed to remain in situations where they might exert an influence hostile to this measure. He threw out this suggestion only as a private individual; and he did so not only for the sake of the honour of the Administration, but for the peace of the country.

Mr. *Tennison* said, he could have wished that his hon. friend (the member for Middlesex) had abstained from the observations he had just made. He had understood his hon. friend in particular to recommend that every thing should be avoided likely to excite irritation, yet he now touched on topics which must create unpleasant feelings in a high quarter. Nothing could be so painful to him, and, also, he was confident to his noble and right hon. friend, near him, and to the country, as that the event which had just been announced should be considered as placing his majesty in a state of submission and subjection to any party. He trusted that, before a few days had elapsed, those who had regretted that the advice tendered to him by the Government for an extensive creation of Peers had not been adopted by the King would be grateful to his Majesty for having declined to administer such a shock to the Constitution, for a shock it would undoubtedly have been. Although he as a thorough Reformer would not have hesitated to give that advice to the King had he been a Cabinet Minister, in case no other means of effecting an extensive Reform offered themselves; yet, if it should turn out that his Majesty, who was undoubtedly bound to ascertain that no other means did exist before he resorted to such a course, had discovered those means, and that without any shock to the institutions of the country, an extensive and perhaps a more beneficial and popular Reform would be the result of such modifications as might now be introduced, he repeated that the country, and his Majesty's Ministers amongst the rest, would be deeply grateful to him for the sound discretion with which he had rejected their counsel. No man could doubt the paternal wishes of his Majesty to do all in his power to meet the wishes of the people, but, if possible, without doing any violence by means of his prerogative to the institutions of the country, and he was, therefore, pained lest the observations of his hon. friend (Mr. Hume), intimating a hope that Peers might still be created, and that other measures might be taken, should give that impression that the Reformers were now acting as if they had obtained a victory over the opinions and feelings of the King.

Mr. *Ruthven* was rejoiced at the communication that had been made, tending as he thought it must do, to allay the agitation into which the public mind had been thrown.

Colonel *Sibthorp* trusted there would be no further discussion at present on either side of the House.

Mr. *Hodges* expressed a similar wish, and contented himself with declaring his gratification at what he had just heard.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* begged to call the attention of the hon. and learned member for Calne to a paragraph in *The Times* of this morning. The hon. and learned Member, in his speech last night, had called him (Sir Henry Hardinge) gallant friend—a courtesy which he had reciprocated. He wished now to ask the hon. and learned Member whether the expressions he had made use of were those which were attributed to him in *The Times*. The words were these:—"The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that the use of swaggering expressions in that place was a very equivocal proof of spirit as well as of sense." That sentence seemed to be an attack upon him (Sir H. Hardinge). He had, at the time it was uttered, a different impression of it; and therefore it was, that now, in the most courteous manner, he requested to know from the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he had applied those words to him?

Mr. *Macaulay* thought it was almost unnecessary for him to say a word on the subject, as he spoke in the presence of those who had heard him make use of the expression. He did not intend to use them in an offensive manner to the right hon. Gentleman; and to have used them in the manner which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to suppose would have been absurd indeed. He had, seeing that the right hon. Gentleman was much excited, employed these expressions with a view to calm him; and had said, that he (Mr. Macaulay) was not the man to swagger there, and that to swagger there was but an equivocal proof of spirit and sense.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that certainly that was the sense in which he had understood the hon. and learned Member.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* said, that the explanation of the hon. and learned Member was perfectly satisfactory to him, and he hoped that the House would not think he had done wrong in soliciting it. With regard to any supposed warmth, he must be allowed to say that considering the relation in which he stood, and had stood for the last twenty or twenty-five years, towards the noble Duke, whom Englishmen of every party must reverence, some latitude might fairly be allowed. It was very far from his intention, in vindicating the noble Duke, by any warmth he showed, to abridge the freedom of discussion; and that noble Duke was the last man who would wish that any attempts of his friends should interfere with that freedom. When, however, an insult was hypothetically offered, during the absence of the party insulted, it was natural that his friends who were present should evince some warmth; he, therefore, hoped to stand excused, as it certainly had not been his intention to take any tone in the debate that was unpleasant.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, May 17, 1832.

MINUTES. Petitions presented. By the Duke of GORDON, from Invernesshire, for Relief to the West-India Interest.—By the Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND, from the Pitmen of the Coal Mines near the Rivers Tyne and Wear for Inquiry and Relief.—By the Earl of WARWICK, from Melbourne, against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland.)

MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS.] The Duke of *Wellington,* after presenting a Petition from Cambridge, against Reform, proceeded to say—My Lords, this is the first occasion on which I have risen to address you since his Majesty confided a most important duty to my charge, and your Lordships, or, at least, some noble Lords here present, are, I am sure, desirous that I should avail myself of this, or some other early opportunity, to explain the nature of the transactions in which I have been engaged. I confess, too, my Lords, that, exposed as I have been to the extreme of misrepresentations, and vilified as I have been in another place, by persons of high condition, and otherwise respectable, I am anxious to take the first opportunity of explaining the nature of the transactions in which I have been engaged, and the grounds on which I acted. Your Lordships will recollect, that, in the course of the last week —I believe on Wednesday last—his Majesty's Ministers informed your Lordships, that, in consequence of their having tendered advice upon an important subject to his Majesty, and his Majesty's not having thought proper to avail himself of that advice, they considered it their duty to tender their resignations to his Majesty, which he was pleased to accept. His Majesty, my Lords, was graciously pleased on that very day, when he was left entirely alone by his Ministers, to send for a noble friend of mine, who had held a high place as well in the service as in the confidence of his Majesty, to inquire if, in his opinion, there were any means, and, if so, what means, of forming a Government for his Majesty, on the principle of carrying an extensive Reform in the Representation of the people. His Majesty, when he had the misfortune of disagreeing with his servants respecting the advice which had been tendered to him, happened to have had so little communication with other men, and was so little acquainted with other opinions on public affairs, that he felt it necessary to send for my noble and learned friend, who was out of the immediate line of politics, and seek for information at his hands. My noble and learned friend informed me of his Majesty's situation, and I considered it my duty to inquire from others, for I was as equally unprepared as his Majesty for the consideration of such a question. I then found that a large number of friends of mine were not unwilling to give their support to a Government formed upon such a principle, and with the positive view of resistance to that advice which was tendered to his Majesty. Under these circumstances I waited on his Majesty on Saturday, and submitted to him my advice. That was, not to re-appoint his late Ministry; nor was it to appoint myself. I did not look to any objects of ambition. I advised him to seek the assistance of other persons to fill the high situations in the State, expressing myself willing to give his Majesty all assistance, whether in office or out of office, to enable his Majesty to form an Administration to resist the advice which had been given to him. My Lords, these were the first steps of the transaction; and if ever there was an instance in which the Sovereign acted most honestly by his former servants—if ever there was an instance in which public men kept themselves most completely apart from all intrigues, and from all indirect influence—using only those direct and honorable means of opposition, of which no man had reason to be other than proud, this is that instance. And when I came to give my advice to his Majesty, instead of advising him with a view to objects of personal ambition—as I have been accused upon high authority—I gave him that advice which I thought would best lead to another arrangement, and I stated that I was ready to serve his Majesty in any, or in no capacity, so as best to assist him in carrying on a Government to resist the advice which had been given him by his late Ministers. And here I beg your Lordships to examine what was the nature of that advice which was tendered to his Majesty by them? I wish your Lordships to examine it. What was the advice which his Majesty did not deem it proper to follow, and which I considered it my duty to enable his Majesty to resist. I do not ask any man to seek any further explanation of this advice than that which was given by the Ministers themselves. It was neither more nor less than this:—The Government, feeling some difficulty in carrying the Reform Bill through this House, were induced to advise his Majesty to do—what?—to create a sufficient number of Peers to enable them to carry their measure through this House of Lords—to force it through this House of Parliament. My Lords, before I go further, let me beg you to consider what is the nature of that proposition? Ministers found, in the course of last Session, that there was a large majority in this House against the principle of the Reform Bill. Now, my Lords, what is the ordinary course for a Minister, under such circumstances, to pursue? My Lords, it is, to alter the measure—to endeavour to make it more palatable to that branch of the Legislature which is opposed to it. But, in this case, the Minister says "no, I will next Session bring in a Bill as efficient as that which has been just rejected." And what did the Minister do? My Lords, I have no hesitation in saying that, notwithstanding the opposition of this House, he brought in a measure stronger and worse than any one of the measures before introduced; and this measure he wished to force through the House by a large creation of Peers. How many Peers it is not necessary to state; it is enough to say, a sufficient number to force it through the House. It is only necessary for me to state the proposition. If this be a legal and constitutional course of conduct—if such projects can be carried into execution by a Minister of the Crown with impunity, there is no doubt that the Constitution of this House and of this country is at an end. I ask, my Lords, is there anybody blind enough not to see that if a Minister can, with impunity, advise his Sovereign to such an unconstitutional exercise of his prerogative as to thereby decide all questions in this House, there is absolutely an end put to the power and objects of deliberation in this House—an end to all just and proper means of decision. I say, then, my Lords, thinking as I do, it was my duty to counsel his Majesty to resist this advice. And, my Lords, my opinion is, that the threat of carrying this measure of creating Peers into execution, if it should have the effect of inducing noble Lords to absent themselves from the House, or to adopt any particular line of conduct, is just as bad as its execution: for, my Lords, it does by violence force a decision on this House, and on a subject, my Lords, on which this House is not disposed to give such a decision. It is true, my Lords, men may be led to adopt such a course, by reflecting, that if they do not adopt it, some fifty or 100 Peers will be introduced, and thus deliberation and decision in this House be rendered impracticable; or men may be led to adopt it with the view of saving the Sovereign from the indignity of having so gross a violation of the Constitution imposed upon him. But I say, my Lords, that the effect of any body of men agreeing publicly to such a course, will be to make themselves parties to this very proceeding, of which, I say, we have so much reason to complain. The only course of proceeding at this eventful crisis worthy of the men with whom I have the honour to be connected was, to advise his Majesty—to counsel his Majesty—to resist the advice which had been given him, if he could find means of carrying on the Government of the country without acceding to it. But this part of the transaction, my Lords, requires particular explanation on my part. His Majesty insisted that some extensive measure of Reform (I use his Majesty's own words) should be carried. I always was of opinion, and am still of opinion, that this measure of Reform is unnecessary, and will prove most injurious to the country. But on the last occasion when I addressed your Lordships—I believe in the Committee on Monday se'nnight—I stated my intention to endeavour to amend the Bill in Committee, and to do it honestly and fairly: still, however, I thought that, amend it as we might in Committee, it was not a measure which would enable this country to have a Government capable of encountering the critical circumstances to which every man must expect this country to be exposed. This was, my Lords, this is my opinion. I do not think that, under the influence of this measure, it is possible that any Government can expect to overcome the dangers to which this country must be exposed. But, my Lords, this was not the question before me; I was called on to assist my Sovereign in resisting a measure which would lead to the immediate overthrow of one branch of the Legislature—a measure which would enable the Ministry to carry through this House the whole Bill, unmodified, unimproved, and unmitigated. I had then, my Lords, only the choice of adopting such part of that Bill as this House might please to send down to the House of Commons, suffering the Government hereafter to depend upon the operation of that part of the Bill rather than upon the whole Bill; or else of suffering the whole Bill to be carried and the House of Lords to be destroyed. My Lords, my opinion is not altered; no part of the Bill is safe; but, undoubtedly, a part of the Bill is better, that is to say less injurious, than the whole Bill; and, certainly, it must at least be admitted that it is better than the whole Bill accompanied by the destruction of the Constitution of the country, by the destruction of the independence of this House. Under these circumstances, my Lords, I gave my consent to assist his Majesty in forming an Administration upon the condition his Majesty mentioned. I know that many noble Lords may be of opinion that I should have acted a more prudent part if I had looked to anterior circumstances, and if I had regarded the opinions and pledges I have already given; and if, placing my attention exclusively upon the desire of acting a consistent part in public life, I had pursued a different course, and refused my assistance to his Majesty, noble Lords will think I should have done better, and have acted more wisely. I do not mean to detract from the merits of those who have thought proper to pursue a course contrary to mine upon this occasion. I am grieved, in particular, that it should have been my misfortune to differ with some right hon. friends of mine, with whom I have been for many years in habits of cordial union, co-operation, and friendship, and from whom I hope this momentary separation will not dissever me. Their position, my Lords, was different from mine. I was situated in a position very different from that in which they felt themselves to stand. They regretted that they could not take the same course with me; but for myself, my Lords, I cannot help feeling, that if I had been capable of refusing my assistance to his Majesty—if I had been capable of saying to his Majesty, "I cannot assist you in this affair," I do not think, my Lords, that I could have shown my face in the streets from shame of having done it—for shame of having abandoned my Sovereign under such distressing circumstances. I have, indeed, the misfortune of differing from friends of mine upon this subject, but I cannot regret the steps I have taken. If I have made a mistake, I regret it; but I am not aware that I have made any mistake. It was impossible that I could shrink from his Majesty under the distressing circumstances in which he was placed. I will not detain your Lordships longer with a detail of the circumstances which led to the dilemma in which we are now placed. But, my Lords, I wish to call your attention to the commencement of those transactions, and if your Lordships look to the Speech which his Majesty made from the Throne to both Houses of Parliament, in June, 1831—if you recollect that his Majesty stated in strong terms, that that important question should receive the earliest and most attentive consideration, with a due consideration of the rights of Parliament, you will be surprised to find us in our present situation. His Majesty then said—"Having had recourse to that measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people on the expediency of a Reform in the Representation, I have now to recommend that important question to your earliest and most attentive consideration; confident that, in any measure which you may propose for its adjustment, you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, are equally secured."* Now, my Lords, I ask, could it be believed at the time his Majesty made this Speech, that the rights of this House—the power of deliberating and deciding independently upon such a question as this, would be destroyed by a creation of Peers, and by a creation to an extent which could not be much less than 100. If any man at the time foretold this, it would have been said he was dreaming of things that were impossible. But to this state, my Lords, have we been brought by this measure. When I first heard of this Bill being proposed to be carried by a creation of Peers I said it was quite impossible. I could not believe that any Minister of England would be led by any considerations whatsoever to recommend such a measure to his Majesty. The first time, indeed, I ever heard the matter mentioned with any degree of authority was, when a right rev. Prelate thought proper to write upon the subject to some people in a town in Sussex. I can appeal to those sitting near me, if this is not the fact—if I did not uniformly declare that the thing was impossible—that the very idea of it ought not to be mentioned; that it never should be imagined that any Minister could be found who would recommend such an unconstitutional — such a ruinous exercise of the prerogative of the Crown. For, my Lords, I do maintain, that the just exercise of the prerogative of the Crown does by no means go to the extent of enabling his Majesty to create a body of Peers with the view to carry any particular measure. Under the circumstances, then, I believe your Lordships will not think it unnatural, when I considered his Majesty's situation, that I should endeavour to assist his Majesty. But, my Lords, when I found that, in consequence of the discussions on Monday in another place (which, by the way, proved so clearly that the sentiments of the leading men then were, that Peers should not be created for such a purpose)—when I found from these discussions that it was impossible to form a Government from that House of such a nature as would secure the confidence of the country, I felt it my duty to inform his Majesty, that I could not fulfil the commission with which he was pleased to honour me, and his Majesty informed me that he would renew his communications with his former Ministry.

---

* Hansard, (third series) vol. iv. p. 85.

Lord *Lyndhurst* said: My Lords, I am anxious to explain my part in these transactions. I feel that it is a duty I owe to my Sovereign — a duty I owe to the country—a duty I owe to your Lordships' House, and, if your Lordships will permit me to say so, a duty which I owe to myself. On the day when his Majesty accepted the resignations of his late Ministers, he was graciously pleased to desire me to attend him at St. James's. I had had no previous communication with his Majesty for a long period. His Majesty said, he was wholly unprepared for the situation in which he was placed—that he sent to me, as his former Chancellor, to consult as to the course he should pursue, and that he was desirous I should collect all the information possible upon the subject, and communicate to him the state of the country and of parties, with the view of affording materials to guide him in his conduct. He gave me permission to communicate with those whom I considered might be useful to me, and he appointed me to meet him at Windsor on the following night. I, of course, as it was my bounden duty to do, obeyed his Majesty. I should have basely shrunk from my duty if I had declined. In consequence of this interview, I waited on my noble friend, the illustrious Duke (the Duke of Wellington), and communicated to him the task which had been imposed upon me by my Sovereign, and the distressing position in which his Majesty was placed. With a spirit worthy of that illustrious individual, he told me that there was no sacrifice he would not make—no obloquy to which he would not expose himself, no misinterpretation to which he would not submit, to rescue his Sovereign from the situation in which he had been placed. It was a duty he owed, the noble Duke said, to his Sovereign and his country, and there was no situation, the highest or the lowest, in which he would not act, as might be most advantageous to his Majesty's service. I communicated also, my Lords, with a few other individuals, on whose judgment I place the greatest reliance, about six, I believe, and I communicated the result of my inquiry to his Majesty at the time appointed; all that was best calculated to afford him assistance—all that I had heard—all that I had learned—the result of my own meditations, I frankly communicated to my Sovereign. His Majesty requested me to invite my noble friend to call on him on Saturday; I did so; and thus my mission terminated. It is for this, my Lords, of which I have now given you a full and faithful narrative, that I have been traduced, maligned, calumniated. It is for this I have been grossly and cruelly calumniated by persons high in station—persons filling the situation and position of Gentlemen. It is for this I have been traduced and vilified by the periodical Press, which now reigns paramount throughout the land, unrestrained by Government. My Lords, I should be ashamed to be a Minister of the Crown one hour, and suffer *The Times* newspaper to go unprosecuted. I should conceive that I had been guilty of little short of treason to my Sovereign, that I had tolerated the degradation of the monarchy, and had been guilty of the most scandalous dereliction of duty towards the laws and Constitution;—if I overlooked its flagrant abuse of Majesty and of your Lordships, I should feel that I had forgotten what I owe to your Lordships, and to a Sovereign, and a free Constitution. As far as relates to myself, I despise these publications. They may wound me, and wound me deeply too, through connexions which are dear to me; but as far as I am myself concerned, I treat them with ineffable scorn. Not so, however, the charges made against me by individuals who are Members of the other House. I should not, however, say made, for I have no accurate means of knowing whether they were made or no? but let me say, the charges published with the names of these individuals. To these I refer. An hon. Baronet, one of the members for Westminster, Sir Francis Burdett, is represented to have said, that as a Judge I had deserted my duty, in the course I pursued when—

The Earl of *Suffolk* here interrupted the noble Lord, and although vehemently called on by a great number of noble Lords to resume his seat, persisted in his attempt to address the House. He said he rose to speak to order. He had suffered the noble Lord to proceed until he named an hon. Member of the other House. He might have been content with designating him as the hon. member for Westminster, but it was most disorderly to name him.

It was decided that Lord Lyndhurst was in order.

Lord *Lyndhurst* resumed: The noble Lord who stated I was out of order, and who was pleased to interrupt me, has only proved that he knew nothing of the orders of this House. I do not say that Sir Francis Burdett has made use of such expressions. I do not believe he can have made use of such expressions. I am not replying to what he said; I am replying to what has been put into his mouth by that calumniating Press. He is reported to have stated that I acted inconsistently with my duty as a Judge of the land. I say, that if he asserted this, he must, taking it at the best, be ignorant of the Constitution of the country. He ought to know, that, as a member of the Privy Council, I am bound, by virtue of my office, to give advice to my Sovereign if he requires it. More than this he ought to know, if he knows anything of the Constitution, that I have taken an oath to this effect; and more, he ought to know, that as a Judge, I am bound to volunteer my advice to his Majesty if I consider any course of proceeding inimical to the safety of the Crown; so that if the hon. Baronet made the assertion which is attributed to him, he has shown himself perfectly ignorant of the Constitution. My Lords, excuse me if I go one step further. He has charged me, as a Judge, with being the leader of a violent and virulent party in your Lordships' House. Talk of order—talk of the irregularity of naming Members of another House! When here you have a Member of Parliament boldly asserting that your Lordships are entertaining and nurturing in your bosom a violent and virulent faction. Whether there is or is not such a faction in this House I will not stay to inquire; I wish to have no motives imputed to me; I impute none to other men. I will only say, that I never aspired to such a position as leader of a party; it is alike foreign to my inclination and my habits. I have neither the disposition nor the leisure for such a place. Since the noble Earl became a Minister of the Crown, I have seldom attended the House; I have taken no part in its proceedings; I never engaged in any political discussions. At last, when the Reform Bill was introduced, I did come forward. My opinions on the measure were expressed long since, in a letter to my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, written from Warwick, when I heard the first Reform Bill was brought forward; and if these were my honest opinions (and who will question it?)—if I thought that the tendency of this measure was to destroy the Sovereignty and the Constitution, was it not my duty as a Judge of the land, as a Privy Councillor, as a Member of your Lordships' House, with all my power to oppose it? If this measure had originated with, and was supported by my earliest and most valued friends—by the very friends of my bosom—I would have acted in the same way. So much for my conduct, and the attacks upon me. For the rest, the Reformers are triumphant—the barriers are broken down—the waters are out—who can predict their course, or tell the devastation they will occasion? I hope, however, my anticipations may prove unfounded, and that the country will not be ruined by the measure which has been forced upon us by the noble Earl.

Earl *Grey* said, it is not my intention to do or say anything which can add to the irritation which prevails; therefore I shall carefully abstain from saying anything which might call into question the personal conduct of either the noble Duke or the noble and learned Lord who has just addressed your Lordships. It was for them to judge what their duty required, and to what extent they were called on by their duty to make a sacrifice of their former opinions, and even to contradict by practice their former declarations. All this was for them to consider—all this might have been required; I, however, impute no improper motives to any man; but, on an occasion of this kind, what I expected was, a temperate explanation from the noble and learned Lord; but, instead of this, we have had a violent invective against the measure. Again have we heard the Reform Bill arraigned as revolutionary, and as tending to destroy the Constitution: this we have heard repeated by the noble and learned Lord: we have been arraigned, too, for our conduct in giving advice to his Majesty which, it is said, if followed, would prove fatal to the independence and character of this House. Before I enter upon a consideration of these charges, let me ask if a course of conduct might not be persevered in which would be scarcely less dangerous to the independence of this House? Might not a course be persevered in which would bring this House into conflict with the other House of Parliament, and with the prevailing sense of the people; and might not this expose the House to far greater dangers than that course which we propose to pursue? But laying this aside for the moment—first, as to Reform in Parliament: I have so often explained the grounds and motives on which it was proposed, that it would be a mere waste of time again to enter at any length, into similar statements. The opinions I expressed on the subject are no new opinions. I have long been convinced of the necessity of Reform, to place the Constitution upon a sound, permanent, and safe foundation. Looking at the situation of the country, I thought the measure could no longer safely be deferred without danger. When, therefore, the noble Duke's Administration resigned—when, according to the new construction, they left the Sovereign alone—when I was called on to assist his Majesty in forming a new Administration—I adhered to those opinions upon the subject which I had asserted out of office, and from which, for the purpose of obtaining office, I certainly would not have departed, and which I never have abandoned; and I, accordingly, made it a condition of my accepting power, that I should have the liberty of proposing a measure of Reform to Parliament. This condition was acceded to, and it then became my duty to consider the extent of the measure; and I determined, that the best and safest course to pursue was, to bring in a measure of such extent as would give satisfaction to the country, and which would be not only consistent with, but conducive to, the safety of the Constitution. It was on this principle I brought in the Bill; but the noble and learned Lord considers it revolutionary, and, therefore, feels it his duty to oppose it. I do not quarrel with his opinions; all I can state is, that my opinions on the subject differ as widely from his as it is possible for difference to extend. I do not complain of the opposition made by the noble Lord; but I do complain of the manner in which it was conducted, in not confining itself to the subject, but branching out into direct personal attacks, which I feel myself called on to disclaim as indignantly as the noble and learned Lord did those matters imputed to him. It is not necessary to go into this long-disputed question of Reform. The Bill, when it was brought forward, received the general approbation of the country, such as no former measure had ever yet commanded. I should like to know if it had not some effect in controlling public opinion, and quieting that agitation which the resistance to that measure raised? I should like to know how it is that even the greatest enemies to Reform now acknowledge that some Reform is necessary—that they no longer oppose it, and at last confess, that it must also be an extensive Reform? I think, then, I was justified in bringing in a measure consistent with those principles I have maintained through life; and if it had been suffered to pass, as it ought to pass, I have no doubt it would have given universal satisfaction throughout the country. This Bill met with a formidable opposition. It passed the House of Commons, after an appeal to the country, by a triumphant majority. Most unfortunately it was rejected by this House. Another Bill, as efficient as this, the noble Duke says, was brought in; but that it is more dangerous I dispute and deny: it had the good fortune to receive the sanction to its principles of a majority of your Lordships on the second reading. I now come to the point which conduced to the present state of affairs. I had hoped that it would pass the Committee without such a change as would render it impossible for me to consent to its being sent down to the other House; but, on the very first clause, a motion was made, the result of which was described as trifling and unimportant; but, in my opinion, it proved such a disposition in this House, and was essentially of such injury to the Bill, that I felt I should not be justified in going further, in deluding the people with the prospect of a success which was never to be attained, and in continuing, by the discussions in the Committee, that irritation throughout the country which it was so necessary to allay. It was then for me to consider which of two courses I would pursue—whether I would abandon the Bill altogether, or whether I would recommend that measure to his Majesty which could alone enable the Government to go on with the Bill. We adopted the latter alternative, and did propose to his Majesty that advice which the noble Duke has arraigned so severely In the course of his observations the noble Duke stated, that this had been acted on as a threat. I am not sensible that I am liable to that imputation. Pressed and goaded as I have been upon the subject, I do not think I breathed a syllable of the matter, excepting once. It was to state that I felt as strongly as most noble Lords the objections to a measure of the description alluded to, unless in such a case of necessity as would justify the constitutional exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, to prevent a collision between the two Houses of Parliament; that was the precise situation in which we were placed; we had either to recommend this measure, with all the risk of consequences, or suffer this House to come into collision with public opinion and the other House of Parliament—a collision to which, if this House were unwise enough to commit itself, it is not easy to suppose that it can be victorious. The noble Duke, in referring to his Majesty's Speech from the Throne in June, asked who could have thought that a measure of this kind would have been proposed? That passage in the Speech which related to a measure of Reform—and I contend that the measure of Reform before your Lordships does possess the qualities there described: it does adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, and it does preserve the prerogatives of the Crown, the authorities of both Houses of Parliament, and it does secure the rights and liberties of the people. We were under the necessity of offering the advice to create as many new Peers as would carry the measure of Reform through this House unmutilated in any of its essential provisions, or resign our offices. Now I say that, under these circumstances, the advice to create new Peers was required. The noble and learned Lord says, that it was not constitutional; but I say that it was constitutional, and I can refer him to books of authority on that subject, in which it is distinctly asserted, that one of the uses of vesting the prerogative of creating new Peers in the Crown is, to prevent the possibility of the recurrence of those evils which must otherwise result from a permanent collision between the two Houses of Parliament; and this danger was rendered imminent by the opposition made to the Reform Bill by the noble Lords on the other side of the House. And, I ask, what would be the consequences if we were to suppose that such a prerogative did not exist, or could not be constitutionally exercised? The Commons have a control over the power of the Crown by the privilege, in extreme cases, of refusing the Supplies; and the Crown has, by means of its power to dissolve the House of Commons, a control upon any violent and rash proceedings on the part of the Commons; but if a majority of this House is to have the power, whenever they please, of opposing the declared and decided wishes both of the Crown and the people, without any means of modifying that power, then this country is placed entirely under the influence of an uncontrollable oligarchy. I say that, if a majority of this House should have the power of acting adversely to the Crown and the Commons, and was determined to exercise that power without being liable to check or control, the Constitution is completely altered, and the government of this country is not a limited monarchy: it is no longer, my Lords, the Crown, the Lords, and Commons, but a House of Lords—a separate oligarchy—governing absolutely the others. On these grounds we tendered that advice to his Majesty which we were well justified, by the spirit and by the letter of the Constitution, in tendering; nay, more—which, under the circumstances, it was our imperative duty to tender, considering the consequences that were likely to result from the failure of the measure. But then it is said by the noble Duke, that the Ministers had, by their resignation, left his Majesty alone, and this was said as if there had been something invidious and improper in this conduct of Ministers. I would ask in what this conduct differs from any other resignation? The Ministers offered that advice to his Majesty which they thought themselves called upon to offer in the situation in which we were placed. His Majesty was pleased to refuse compliance with our advice, and then we most respectfully tendered our resignations, being the only course which remained for us to follow, if we were prepared to act as honest and independent men. We did not, however, leave his Majesty alone, or abandon him, in any invidious or ungenerous sense of the word, but merely acted in the manner that was due to our character and honour as honest and independent men. I believe that the noble Duke himself, on reflection, will be convinced that there was no want on our part of respectful duty to his Majesty; and that there was nothing extraordinary in our resignation, considering the circumstances in which we were placed; and that we have deserved no reproaches for any audacious or ungracious abandonment of his Majesty. If we could have been guilty of any invidious or ungracious proceeding towards his Majesty, or any want of duty with respect to him, we must have been the most ungrateful of men; for never did men owe more to a Sovereign for the uniform kindness, condescension, and confidence with which we have been treated by his Majesty; and as to the attacks to which the noble Duke alludes, as having been made on his Majesty in the public Press, all I can say is, that I had no concern whatever in these attacks, and that neither the noble Duke, nor any other Peer in this House, can be more distressed at them than I have been. I have always proclaimed, and now do in the most public manner proclaim, that I have always firmly believed, and do firmly believe, that his Majesty was actuated by the very best motives on this, as on every other occasion. I do not think it necessary for me to say any more on the present occasion, for I suppose nobody will expect that I should disclose what has passed confidentially between his Majesty and myself, without having first distinctly obtained his Majesty's consent and permission; and it ought always to be recollected, that it is contrary to the principles and the practice of the Constitution to arraign the personal conduct of the Sovereign. This much I thought it my duty to say in vindication of his Majesty, to whom I must ever remain bound in gratitude for the kindness and confidence with which he has been pleased always to treat me; for the present it is not fitting that I should make any communication as to what has passed between his Majesty and myself, beyond what I before stated. I before stated that I was again in communication with his Majesty, because I thought that, as to that particular, and as to the views which I myself entertained, there ought to be no concealment from this House; but I cannot state at this moment that this communication between his Majesty and myself has been attended with any result: all I can state is, that I still continue to be of opinion, that full effect ought to be given to the Bill of Reform now on your Lordships' Table, and that it ought to be passed unmutilated and unimpaired in all its main principles and essential provisions.

The Earl of *Mansfield* spoke as follows:—My Lords;—If upon ordinary occasions I feel embarrassment in addressing your Lordships, and that awe which such an assembly is calculated to inspire, that feeling must now be much stronger, when I have to direct your attention from that important subject which is uppermost in all our thoughts, and under discussion, to circumstances which concern one of the humblest individuals in this House, who has now the honour to address you. When at any time I have ventured to speak, though with diffidence as to the correctness of my judgment of my power of supporting, by convincing arguments, the opinions which I entertained, I have always endeavoured to express my sentiments without ambiguity, nor do I know that there was even one which I was ever tempted to retract; but opinions or expressions which are erroneously imputed to me, when they affect others, it is my duty to disclaim. If, in such misrepresentation I only were concerned, I should treat it, I do assure your Lordships, with unaffected contempt; but I observed a statement in the public papers, that the noble and illustrious Duke near me had invited me to take office, and that I had declined that invitation. I also observed a statement, that his Majesty had invited me to support the Administration formed by the noble Duke, and that I had replied, that I had had enough of the Duke of Wellington and his conduct. Of these statements I can only say, that they are false, and that the latter is not only false, but grossly insulting to his Majesty. In the audience which I had of his Majesty, there were only two persons present, and it is insulting to his Majesty that any account, and particularly so very incorrect an account, should have been given of what passed at that interview. I thought it my duty to state thus much in regard to the interview I had with his Majesty.

With regard to the speech of the noble Duke near me, that must have made a due impression. No doubt the Duke was placed in a painful situation, and every one must applaud the explanation which he has given, whether they concur with him in the course which he has felt himself constrained to adopt, or not. It was no doubt painful to him to submit to imputations which he knew were unjust; but, with his usual forbearance, he delayed giving an explanation which might impede the settlement of the Government, considering the situation in which his Majesty was placed. The calumnies which have been circulated he anticipated and disregarded—they can only impose on the credulous and the prejudiced; but it appears strange that those who, not incapable of generous actions themselves, and, therefore, disposed to appreciate fairly the motives of others, should not have been more active in discountenancing reports which they knew to be unfounded. As for myself, whenever I opposed the measures of the noble Duke, or any other Minister, it was from objecting to the measures themselves, and not from enmity to those from whom they emanated; nor have I, on the other hand, ever submitted my judgment to the control of any individual, however illustrious, but have overcome the feelings of private friendship and of esteem for public character, when, upon public grounds, I thought that opposition was necessary: I have assumed neither the habit nor the language of dependence. But I should do violence to my feelings if I were not to make some remarks upon the statement we have heard, though it is quite impossible for me to express, in adequate terms, my admiration of the noble, patriotic, and disinterested conduct of the noble Duke. I may express my opinions more freely, because I have every reason to believe that, in the progress of the discussion on the Bill, even if the resignation of Ministers had not taken place, I should not have concurred with him in those concessions which he, from the best and purest of motives, appeared disposed to make, although to that extent the majority of the House would probably have consented. But the matter of the greatest importance is, to see what took place in the course of this business. His Majesty found himself placed in a painful situation, and sent for the noble Duke, who, when so called upon, could not refuse to comply with the invitation. The noble Duke did not, however, propose that he himself should take office, but, on the contrary, advised his Majesty to take others into his councils. Did that shew any eagerness for place?

The noble Earl opposite could not deny that Ministers had left his Majesty in a painful and distressing predicament; but he said that Ministers were placed in circumstances in which they could not act otherwise; and what are these circumstances? On Monday the House proceeded to discuss the clauses of the Bill in Committee, and that was the occasion for proposing such alterations and amendments as might be deemed requisite. It was, indeed, a main argument for the second reading, that alterations and amendments might be proposed in the Committee. That was the proper time for proposing such alterations and amendments, and for making such alterations they had the example of the noble Earl himself, who had made an alteration, and that not an unimportant one, in his measure. It was proposed that in the discussion of the clauses, preference should be given to the enfranchising part of the Bill. I think this was not of sufficient importance to justify the opposition which Ministers made to it, and so I said at the time. The noble Earl has explained the reason why he thought otherwise; and yet this is somewhat strange, when it is considered that a colleague of the noble Earl said, in another place, that it was a matter of indifference whether the other House began with the enfranchising, or disfranchising, clauses. The noble Earl, however, says, that no one could give the preference to the enfranchising clauses, but from hostility to the Bill. According to my experience as to what has been the practice in Committee, I have always understood, that those who objected to a Bill might act according to circumstances, propose amendments or alterations which might disfigure a bill in the eyes of its supporters, and this with perfect fairness; but the noble Duke declared, before the second reading, that if the Bill should go to the Committee, he would endeavour to amend it. He made the same declaration in the Committee; and, though this straightforward course was natural to him, I own that I did not like his expression, that proposing alterations which were not to be amendments, was a "dirty course of proceeding," for it seemed to me not to be inconsistent with parliamentary practice; but this proved the sincerity of the noble Duke as to the view with which he proposed the alteration. If I understand the practice of this House aright, I should say that no noble Lord is expected to throw up a bill which he has introduced, merely because some alterations of it may be proposed in Committee. But the noble Earl, it appears, so far from being willing to accommodate himself to the usual practice of the House, resolves that there shall be not only no alterations, but he even will not allow a transposition of the clauses.

Now I should have thought that the

most natural proceeding was, to begin with the enfranchising clauses, and that the first consideration ought to be—not that Old Sarum had Members, but that Manchester had none. That was naturally the first grievance to be considered; and when it had been seen which towns were entitled to send Members, Parliament should have that power which was formerly possessed by the Crown, of sending writs to populous towns, which was for the last time exerted in the case of Newark, and which, whether it continues to exist or not, was virtually taken away by the union with Scotland, which limited the number of Members; then, as any addition to this number would be inconvenient, enfranchisement must be met by proportionate disfranchisement; and, after having settled what places ought to be enfranchised, and what additional Members should be given to Scotland and to Ireland (if any), we might then have gone on to consider how far the disfranchisement ought to be carried, in order to refrain from adding to the actual number of the present House of Commons. No good reason was assigned for refusing to adopt this course. The matter was of no serious importance, and the opposition of Ministers appears rather unaccountable. Indeed, it had been reported that his Majesty's Ministers intended to give up the point; and this was so much believed, that, to my knowledge, several Peers were leaving the House, and were only detained by the consideration that there might be a division, if not upon that, upon other clauses. I will appeal to the recollection of many of your Lordships, whether the noble Earl's statement, that it was impossible for him to go on with the Bill, did not cause great surprise? The reason which was avowed could hardly be the true one, and we asked each other, what could be the real reason; was it that Ministers were conscious that they had involved themselves so deeply in the Irish Reform Bill, more revolutionary than this, and which must lead to the separation of Ireland from England—or was it, perhaps, a tardy acknowledgment of their own unfitness—had the distracted state of Ireland, or the flames and insurrections in the West Indies, caused by their orders, touched their hearts, that they were anxious to get rid of offices which they were not fit to hold, and, therefore, had resolved to give advice which they could hardly expect his Majesty to follow, and then, that advice having been rejected, they resigned? It has been imputed, and I really should have thought with no great injustice, that the noble Earl used the intended creation of Peers as a threat. Now, he denies that he ever used any such threat; but, I believe it will be acknowledged, that something of that nature has been circulated by those supposed to be connected with Ministers. The noble Earl said, that he mentioned the subject only once; but, goaded and taunted as he had been, when allusions had been made, as they were frequently (indeed, upon two occasions, by myself), they were not serious; for, in fact, it was supposed that the noble Lords were incapable of offering such advice, or that, if it were given, it would be rejected. The noble Earl, however, has given that advice—has declared it to be a just exercise of the royal prerogative, and that it was inevitable. I will, therefore, now particularly advert to this declaration. Even if the proposed amendments had all been adopted, yet they would still have left in force the three great principles of the Bill—namely, enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and an extension of the franchise; indeed, to such a degree would this have been the case, that, when the noble Baron detailed the nature of those amendments which the Bill he wished to introduce would embrace, the noble Earl admitted that he found the noble Baron was adopting the principal provisions of his Bill, but declared that the noble Baron was carrying his principles to an excess, and was proposing what, in the noble Earl's opinion, was too democratical. But, my Lords, what argument has the noble Earl adduced to justify the extreme measure he has ventured upon advising his Majesty to adopt? It is this—that there was no other alternative by which the continuance of the collision between the two Houses of Parliament could be prevented, than by applying to his Majesty to exercise his prerogative in the creation of Peers. But, my Lords, admitting (though only for the sake of argument) that there really exists that collision between this and the other House of Parliament, which it is alleged by the noble Earl does exist, still, in my humble opinion, there was another alternative to which the noble Earl might have had recourse, besides the extreme and dangerous one to which he has thought it proper to advise his Majesty to resort. It is true, my Lords, that in consequence of the King's appeal to the voice and sense of the people upon the subject of Reform, the present House of Commons was returned; and, by returning such a House, the country has certainly declared itself in favour of Reform; but the country could not have declared itself in favour of this particular Bill, nor even of the bill of the last Session of Parliament, from which the present Bill varies in so many of its provisions; and, if not of that, much less of this Bill; therefore, my Lords, I submit there was still another alternative open to the noble Earl, and it was this—if the amendments proposed in Committee had been adopted by this House, but rejected by the House of Commons, he should have resorted to the step of appealing to the sense of the people, and of ascertaining whether they were in favour of the Bill as amended, or not. That, my Lords, was an alternative which the noble Earl might have well adopted before he proposed to his Majesty to infuse such a number of Peers into this House as was necessary to enable the noble Earl to carry the present measure.

The noble Earl conceives, that, if he were to allow this House such a concession as is required, the country would be governed by an oligarchy; and therefore, my Lords, the independence of this House, and the honest efforts of noble Lords to amend this Bill, are to be neutralized by a large infusion of new Peers, whose votes are to be at the nod and bidding of the noble Earl; that is, indeed, governing by an oligarchy. Now, my Lords, the number of Peers which the noble Earl proposed to his Majesty to create is certainly unknown to me. I know not whether the number can be distinctly stated; but that the creation must be to a very considerable extent there can be no doubt—whether it be forty, fifty, sixty, or even a hundred, as some have alleged.

No attempt has been made on this side of the House to deprecate the exercise of the royal prerogative in such a manner as we know to be constitutional; upon that point, this side of the House, notwithstanding its just apprehensions, has uniformly conducted itself with a proper sense of the respect which is due to the constitutional privileges of the Crown. But, supposing the noble Earl's advice had been adopted, and that, for the purpose of drowning the independent voice of your Lordships, a large creation of Peers was determined upon, where, I would ask, are those new Peers to be found? I admit that there are many individuals, well entitled by their character, their property, and their talent to look forward to be at some time introduced within the walls of this House, but where the noble Earl could have found such a number as is necessary for his purpose, ready to prostitute their honour to party purposes and political intrigues, I know not—indeed, it would have been impossible.

I remember, and it will never be effaced from my memory, when the noble Duke returned from Spain, and his patents were read at that Table, the reading whereof occupied such a time as almost to fatigue the Officer of the House, without, however, exhausting his patience, and I will ask, when we saw the noble Duke standing at that Table, thus hearing his great and splendid services recorded, and the manner in which they were, by a grateful Monarch, acknowledged and rewarded, what British heart, either of your Lordships or of the other spectators, on that day did not beat high at such a magnificent spectacle—did not swell at the exulting thought? How glorious was that country which could produce a man who had rendered such splendid services—how happy that people, and the Sovereign who could so reward him! But, if the noble Earl should be allowed to create Peers with whom one "would not march through Coventry," when they shall come to this Table, perhaps some Wednesday, when there may be few to see them, and have their patents read, in which their services cannot be recorded, for they will have performed none, but when it could only be stated, that his Majesty, *ex mero motu,* had determined to promote them to the dignity of Peers of the realm, and having called upon their Maker to witness their determination to discharge the obligations they have contracted, and faithfully perform their duty to their country, they may then enroll their names on the list of the Members of this House, who will feel themselves contaminated by such an association, and that the persons thus introduced are consigned to infamy, which—such is the envious nature of mankind—is much more durable than fame! That the noble Duke attempted to extricate the King from his present most painful and difficult position is not to be lamented, even though his efforts have not been attended with success. It is not for the concessions which he was prepared to make that political inconsistency could be fairly imputed to him, especially by those whom I have so often heard in this House declare, that Statesmen ought to yield to the imperiousness of circumstances. Nor, indeed, was this the offence alleged against him. How often has the noble Duke been told by the noble Lords opposite, that, great and various as his life had been, he possessed no knowledge of mankind, and was, consequently, incompetent to govern an enlightened people. It was not, then, that he was accused of error, or inconsistency, in being willing to make concessions, but his crime was, that those concessions were coupled with office. The noble Duke, however, has this night told your Lordships, that he has not accepted office; that office was a thing which he did not desire or seek, but that he would rather that office should be held by those to whom he could conscientiously give his support.

But, my Lords, is there not something to be said as to the passion displayed for office on the part of others? On a former occasion, noble Lords, after having long and ardently supported Catholic Emancipation, were content to see that measure carried by the noble Duke. Have they less zeal now? Was not their language on that occasion to this effect—"true, it is hard to see that a measure originating with us is to be carried by our political adversaries; but still, it is one of such great consequence to the country, that we are ready to accept from their hands the important boon." Now, my Lords, you are not willing to accept a similar boon from any other hands than those by whom it has been first offered. I ask, whether this change of conduct does not evince that you have a greater predilection for office than for Reform? It is true, my Lords, the noble Duke has found it impossible to form an Administration; but I, nevertheless, wish to speak in terms of the greatest esteem towards those who, on this occasion, have declined co-operating with the noble Duke, because I am convinced, that, although they may not agree with the noble Duke on the necessity of concession, yet there is not one of them who does not view his character and conduct at this conjuncture with admiration. Every fair and impartial person must see that it was perfectly possible, considering the situation in which a Minister at the head of an Administration would, in the present state of the country, be placed, that both parties may be actuated by the purest motives, and yet not be able to come to the same conclusion. But, my Lords, there is something more than mere success that constitutes the reward of our exertions—it is the consciousness of the rectitude of our conduct.

Although the noble Duke has failed in the attempt to serve his Sovereign, yet it will always be to him a proud reflection that he made that attempt. And, my Lords, it appears to me, that certain verses, describing the feelings of another illustrious character, may be well applied on this occasion to the noble Duke; and as they will serve better to express my feelings on the subject than any language which I can command, I will venture to quote them to your Lordships. The power of virtue would be thus acknowledged by the noble Duke. He knows

> "How her unshaken power
> Is independent of success;
> That no defeat can make it less,
> No conquest make it more."

And this reflection—

> "'Midst sorrow, cares, and dire dismay
> Brought calm and sure relief;
> He scrutiniz'd his noble heart,
> Found virtue had perform'd her part,
> And peaceful slept the Chief."

I wish I could speak in the same way of the measure of the noble Earl—that revolutionary measure which the noble Earl has adopted. But, my Lords, the fact cannot be so disguised. My opinion of that measure is recorded. I will not do the noble Earl the injustice to suppose that he can at all contemplate the injurious consequences which I am certain will flow from the adoption of that measure. My Lords, I am not vindictive; and, therefore, I do earnestly pray that the noble Earl, for his own sake, may, in his dying hour, reflect with as calm satisfaction upon his conduct as he does now. I wish it, my Lords, I say, for his own sake, but he may take warning from a political adversary, and I tell him, that I think it impossible that such calm self-approbation can await him at that hour, when reflecting on his conduct. Hurt, my Lords, although his feelings may be, wounded, if I may say so, as his pride may be (for it is not uncharitable to impute to him those frailties from which none are exempt), I again entreat him to reflect on the consequences that must result from the line of conduct which he is now pursuing. I have had an audience of his Majesty, and I then ventured to give that advice which I had a right to do; I implored his Majesty to pause before he resorted to that measure—the creation of

Peers, by which the independence of the House of Lords would be destroyed. The same advice which I gave to his Majesty I now give to the noble Earl, and I now call on him to pause before he does that which will annihilate the independence, and threatens the existence of this House. I have no right to say what are the motives or what are the future views of the noble Earl, but I should be abstaining from saying here what I have constantly said without these walls, and what has been often addressed to me by others, if I did not now state, that it is suspected, that the creation of Peers is not merely for the purpose of carrying this Bill. That, indeed, is the ostensible purpose; that is the pretence, but not the reason of their creation. The real object in view is, that Ministers may fortify their party, and reduce the majority of this House to become their dependents. But here again I would warn the noble Earl to take a lesson from history, and to look at the consequences of the acts of two Ministers of France, who resorted to a similar expedient for overwhelming the House of Peers, and who were, in the course of a few months, deprived of their power, and in the majority which thus drove them from office were to be found a great number of those Peers whom they had themselves so lately created. But such is not my object, nor the object of my noble friends around me; nay, I go further, and declare, that, so far from entertaining any hostility that way towards the noble Earl, and imitating a great example, I would rather that the noble Earl and his colleagues should continue in office, though differing so much as I do on most questions, both of our domestic and foreign policy, than that they should give way to those who, if this unlimited Bill should pass, must succeed them; those successors will be, not the noble Duke, nor any of my noble friends around me, they will be individuals whom I will not particularly designate or name, but, borrowing an expression from our neighbours, they will be persons coming from the *extrême gauche*, and then I should like to know whether, when these anticipations become realized, the noble Lords themselves will any further doubt, that the introduction of those persons into power was the natural and inevitable consequence of that measure which they have themselves originated and carried into effect.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that when he looked at the extraordinary situation in which the country and the Sovereign were placed, and when he considered that perhaps this was the last time that he should ever have an opportunity to address himself to their Lordships as an independent branch of the Legislature, he found it impossible to refrain from giving expression to his opinions. And, in the first place, he was anxious to give expression to that feeling which was uppermost in his heart—that feeling which he should retain to the last moment of his existence—a feeling of unbounded gratitude to his Sovereign for having scorned and scouted an advice which went to swamp the independence of that House, and which tended to the certain destruction of the monarchy of this country. He could not, in the next place, refrain from expressing the feelings of scalding indignation which he entertained towards his Majesty's Government for having given such an advice, at the same time that he felt joy and satisfaction in reflecting that a member of that Government—a noble individual, on whose friendship he placed, as he ought, the highest value—was reported, and he believed truly reported, to have stood alone in his opinion against the adoption of such a measure. With respect to the line of conduct which the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had thought proper to pursue, in placing the Sovereign in the most extraordinary situation that a Monarch of this country had ever been placed in, he, for one, could not dive into the motives which had influenced that noble Earl in pursuing such a line of conduct. The noble Earl had, in the discussion on the Amendment which had been carried by their Lordships, told them, that he considered it as fatal to the Bill; whereas, when the Bill was in the other House of Parliament, one of the noble Earl's colleagues there had declared, that it was a perfect matter of indifference whether they commenced in the first instance with the enfranchisement or the disfranchisement clause. He, therefore, did not know, as he had said already, looking merely at that Amendment, what motives the noble Earl had in giving such advice to the Sovereign. But when, after that Amendment was carried, a noble Baron, who had hitherto opposed the Bill, stood up and stated the course which he and his friends intended to pursue, intimating his intention to concede the great leading principles of the Bill—namely, schedule A, and the 10*l.* qualification, in such a way as that it would be a *bonâ fide* qualification—that the noble

Earl, after such an intimation, should have acted as he had, confirmed almost to a certainty the suspicion which he (the Earl of Winchilsea) entertained, that this measure had merely been brought forward by the noble Earl ostensibly for the purpose of tranquillizing the public mind and satisfying the people; and had induced him to doubt as to whether the noble Earl and his colleagues were sincere in their declarations as to this measure, and whether they had not ulterior objects in view—namely, the making this Bill the plea for creating Peers, so as to render themselves independent of that House. Again he would express that feeling of indignation which he entertained for the line of conduct pursued in this instance by his Majesty's Government, and by the noble Earl—a feeling which he should entertain to the last hour of his life. He was anxious to say so much, for God only knew how long he should live, and he should not wish to outlive the downfall of that House. He wished to say so much before that House, which had been graced by so many men of whom any country in the world might be justly proud, should be consigned to destruction. He would say this, that the advice which the noble Earl had given to the King was the most insulting and most daring that had ever been given to a Sovereign of this country. He did not deny the power of the Sovereign to create Peers, or to issue writs, and to give Representatives to any places that might have grown up in the country — he did not deny the power of the Crown to do all that without the consent of that House; but what was it the noble Lord contended for? Why, that if any measure should be carried by the other House of Parliament, in accordance with the wishes of the people, the power of the Crown should be exercised in such a way as to destroy the independence of that House, and to gratify the desires of the people. If the noble Earl had felt what was due to that House, he would not have endeavoured to drown its voice in a question of such importance as that of reforming the House of Commons. He begged, for one, to return his heartfelt thanks to the noble Duke near him for his disinterested conduct. If justice were done to that noble Duke, the country would deeply appreciate and highly approve of his conduct in this instance. The noble Duke found his Sovereign placed in a situation of the utmost difficulty. He highly appreciated the efforts which were made by the noble Duke and his friends to form an Administration under such circumstances; and this he would say, in the face of their Lordships and of the country, that for the purpose of rescuing the Sovereign from the degrading situation in which he had been placed by the noble Earl and his Majesty's Government, there was no sacrifice which he should not be ready to make, even the sacrifice of his consistency. He would ask himself, in thus acting, this question—if there were men so deprived of every feeling that ought to animate British statesmen, that however deep might be their sense of the necessity of a measure, they would propose to strike a blow, not only at the independence of that House, but at the liberties of the people (for where would there be any security for the liberties of the people if that House, an independent branch of the Legislature, should be destroyed?)—if there were men, and men in power, ready so to act, should not every thing be done that was possible to avert such a calamity? This he would say, that it was his conviction, that if a creation of Peers should take place, Parliament would become a mere cipher, and would cease to exist as an independent organ of the voice of the people. When he saw in that House so many noble Lords who could boast of ancestors that had done great things for their country's good —when he reflected what would be the feelings of such men if they beheld such a blow aimed at the independence of the House of Peers, he called upon them, who valued life less than honour, to evince for the advice which had been offered to his Majesty the utmost scorn and contempt, and to oppose, to the last hour of their lives, the measure that was to be carried into effect by the ruin of the House of Peers of England.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that he merely rose for the purpose of stating to their Lordships the opinion which had been communicated to him on this subject from a respectable part of the country. He had been intrusted with the presentation of an Address to his Majesty, from the town of Belfast, signed by 4,000 or 5,000 persons, and adopted, after the fact had been promulgated as to the advice supposed to have been given by Ministers to the Sovereign, respecting the creation of Peers. He would not trust himself in expressing his own feelings on that subject, but he would state to their Lordships the opinion expressed in this Address — an opinion which he was sure would soon prevail from one end of the country to the other. The individuals who signed this Address, and who resided in the town of Belfast, congratulated his Majesty on his having resisted the unconstitutional advice which had been given him to create a number of Peers for the purpose of carrying a particular measure; and expressed themselves satisfied, that his Majesty would call to his councils men who would endeavour to promote the good of the country at large. He thought it right to state the opinion expressed in that Address, which he was certain only expressed the rising feeling of the country on the subject. He could not sit down without asking the noble Earl opposite a question. The noble Earl and his colleagues were at present addressed as the Ministers of the country; now he wished to know, whether they were to understand that the noble Earl was at present the first Minister of the Crown, and whether they were to understand that the advice given by him to his Majesty had been accepted or refused?

Earl *Grey* said, that the question which the noble Marquis put to him had already been answered by him that evening, for he had already stated, that the communication which he had received from his Majesty had not as yet led to any conclusive result, and he could not, at present, state more. He, therefore, now stood in the same situation that every Minister stood who had tendered his resignation—whose resignation had been accepted, and in whose instance it remained undecided whether he should return to office or not. With regard to the subject to which the noble Marquis alluded, perhaps he (Earl Grey) had already stated all that it was necessary for him to state on that point; but a charge had been raised against him of having done something unfair and improper towards the Sovereign, which he would, once for all, briefly notice. He was charged with having left his Majesty alone, deserted, and unprovided. Now, he begged to say, as, indeed, he had already stated, that he had done nothing more than any other Minister had ever done, whose advice had been rejected. It was not he and his colleagues who had left his Majesty in an unprovided situation, and without an Administration, but it was the noble Lords on the other side who, the House had been told, over and over again, were the fittest persons in the country for office, and yet who, when his Majesty wanted an Administration, refused to form one. If, then, his Majesty had been left alone, his being so was not to be attributed to those who had felt it their duty to resign, but to those persons who, considering the Administration an injurious one, and opposing it as such, when it was at an end would not themselves take office. "I beg," continued the noble Earl, "again to state, that, unless I can be assured of the ability of carrying the Bill fully and efficiently through this House, I shall not again return to office."

The *Lord Chancellor:* I do not mean to occupy your Lordships' time in adding a word to what has dropped from my noble friend except to state, that which, I am sure, was passing across his mind at the time he addressed your Lordships; namely, that, considering the absolute necessity, in the present state of the country, of passing this measure, we shall not again return to office except upon the condition, not only of our possessing the ability to carry the Bill efficiently through this House, but also to carry it through with every reasonable despatch, consistently with the due discussion of its various provisions.

The Earl of *Haddington* said, that, after the speech of the noble Earl opposite, whom he must still call the head of the Government, he wished to offer a few observations to their Lordships. The noble Earl had endeavoured to show, that the Constitution of this country, as laid down by the ablest writers, intrusted a power to the Crown to make a great increase of the peerage on emergencies of urgent importance; and, he had attempted to prove, that this House had placed itself in the situation contemplated by those writers, as justifying the exercise of such a prerogative. Wishing to avoid all topics of irritation, he would not now enter into an argument upon the general question, but he must protest against the statement of the noble Earl. There was nothing in the conduct of that House, from the commencement to the end of the discussion on this subject, that could by possibility place it in collision with the House of Commons; and there was nothing in the conduct of their Lordships that could justify any constitutional Minister, for the purpose of passing a measure like the present, to advise his Majesty to stifle the voice and annihilate the independence of that branch of the Legislature, and thereby to lay the foundation of the ultimate ruin of the Monarchy itself. The conduct of the noble Duke had been called into question because he had obeyed the voice of his Sovereign in coming forward to assist him in his utmost need. He had never been a partisan of that noble Duke. As far as there had been an opposition to the noble Duke, he might be said to have belonged to it. He had formed no connexion with that noble Duke, but he felt that he should be acting a base part if he did not come forward and state, in the face of their Lordships and of the country, however such a statement might expose him to obloquy and abuse, that the noble Duke was entitled to the gratitude of their Lordships for doing what he had done. They talked of principles as being what should influence the conduct of Gentlemen, but surely no man would say that time and circumstances might not become so altered as to render the application of the principles which an individual had adopted totally impracticable. Was there a man who would not be guided in his conduct by the dangers and difficulties by which he might be surrounded, and who might not feel it necessary, on some occasions, to give up some of his principles in order to avert the occurrence of greater evils? Though the course of the noble Duke had, up to the last moment, been that of uncompromising opposition to the Reform Bill, and though he might consider it a measure fatal to the Monarchy of England, yet, when he found his Sovereign placed in the dilemma into which he had been thrown, if he had not attempted to assist that Sovereign, would he not be justly chargeable with contributing to the dilemma in which his Sovereign was placed, and to the difficulties by which he was surrounded? Again, he repeated, that the noble Duke was entitled to their gratitude for the course which he had taken. If the noble Duke had succeeded in forming an Administration on the principle that he proposed to make it—namely, to proceed with the Reform Bill, and to settle that question in a manner least detrimental to the interests of the Monarchy of this country—he would have been entitled to, and should have had, his humble but hearty support.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, he should not commence the observations he was about to address to their Lordships by pronouncing an eulogium on the noble Duke near him, (the Duke of Wellington), nor offer anything in praise of that noble Duke's conduct on a recent occasion: it was above all praise. If he (the Earl of Carnarvon) adopted any mode of eulogizing or offering the meed of praise to the noble Duke, it would be by contrasting the conduct he had pursued with that of those to whom he had been politically opposed; and if he imputed to the noble Duke any motive by which he might have been led into error, it would be to ignorance of existing facts. But to turn to his Majesty's present Government. It was said by them, that the great object of their Administration had been to allay external irritation; but, from what he (the Earl of Carnarvon) had heard to-night, he was induced to think the endeavours of no Ministry could have been further from the object. And here he could not help adverting to what he had heard as having fallen from an individual of considerable moment in the financial world. That individual was reported to have said, "Well, a Whig Minister is the strangest man I ever saw: he continues heaping fresh coals on the fire, and at the same time exclaims it is too hot to be borne." Of the line of conduct which the present Government were reported to pursue to his Majesty, and which it was said they were still pursuing (and which, perhaps, was the reason why they were not now prepared to report the determination of the Monarch), he would say (if it were true), that a more cruel duress had never before been put upon a most excellent Sovereign—a Sovereign who was entitled to the love and gratitude of all his subjects. But they now said, indeed, that they had done with violent steps, while, in point of fact, the more than revolutionary measure of Reform was again actually being pressed upon a reluctant Sovereign—reluctant because he was constitutional. If he (the Earl of Carnarvon) was now to say that the statement of the present Government in this respect was not accurate, he should be charged with making a most uncourteous attack upon them, and that, too, by those who had charged noble Lords sitting on his side of the House with a most uncourteous and ungracious trick on the occasion of the division last week. If, however, he were to make any comment on the accuracy of the Representation of the Government, he should say, that they had hurried on in a most violent course, because they feared that if noble Lords sitting at his side of the House were permitted to introduce their measure of Reform, not all their power or influence could have produced the collision which they certainly having, as he thought, the power, had not prevented. Collision did he say? Why, the colleagues of the noble Earl opposite in another place, it had been told their Lordships, regarded the only vote to which their Lordships had come in Committee as a vote of indifference: so that, while the event was regarded by the members of the Government sitting in their Lordships' House as a collision, it was looked upon elsewhere with indifference. With respect to the right of his Majesty to create Peers, he was not prepared to admit all the principles which had been urged, and the arguments which had been offered, in favour of such a proceeding under the present state of affairs. The history of the country recorded only one such act, and it also recorded that the Minister who recommended that Act was impeached. But he would contend, that before such advice had been offered to his Majesty—even had a collision really taken place—his Majesty's Ministers ought to have first tried what would have been effected by their opponents in the Committee. They well knew that no one act in Committee was definitive, and they ought to have waited to have seen what amendments were made, and then it would have been time enough, if they thought the amendments tended to endanger the safety of the Crown or of the State, to have called on his Majesty to exercise his prerogative of creating Peers, if he possesses any such prerogative. That, however, had not been their course, for they well knew, if noble Lords had been permitted to bring forward their amendments to the provisions of the measure, neither in the House of Commons nor in the country would they have been enabled to have kept alive the agitation which was the object of their Administration. He would here beg to inquire if it was true, that Ministers had not only asked the King to make twenty-five or twenty-six Peers, but, that he had already made them; and if, in addition, they had sought an abstract promise from his Majesty to create as many Peers as they might think necessary to secure the success of their measure of Reform? Was such a demand any thing less than seeking to put the Crown of these realms in commission, and to make the noble Earl opposite first commissioner? This demand, too, was made to secure the passing of a measure, the object of which was, to abolish all corrupt proprietary boroughs, while the framers of that measure wished to make the House of Lords a most abject corrupt borough in the hands of the Lord Protector. He conceived the question between the Minister and his Majesty at present really to be—is William the 4th King of these realms, or is the noble Earl opposite the Lord Protector? He had already said, that had the noble Lords who sat near him been heard in Committee, agitation in the country would have been suspended, and though he did not mean to impute to the noble Earl an intention to practise a deception on their Lordships, yet he could not but think, that a cessation of agitation was not desired; for, he did not hesitate to say, that in no other state of the country than that of irritable excitement would any Minister avow such a proposition as that which had been made to his Majesty, for he was sure that no Englishman, a friend to Reform, would endure the thought that the King, himself a Reformer, though wishing for a modification of the Bill now on their Lordships' Table, and anxious for conciliation, should be pressed to a violation of his royal prerogative. He could not but also complain of the line of conduct pursued by the noble Earl towards their Lordships after the division of last week. He would ask the noble Earl, who was once a Whig, but, what was he now?—he would ask the noble Earl whether a more cool and deliberate insult was ever offered by any Minister to an independent Legislature since the days when Cromwell ordered that "that bauble (pointing to the mace) should be removed?" If such a course of conduct was to be pursued or continued, he should feel it his duty to move, that in their Lordships' House the bauble should also be taken away; for, instead of that, as the proper accompaniment of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, the cart-whip of the slave-driver would be better calculated to awe into control such an assembly as their Lordships' House would be, if the degradation proposed was really inflicted upon it. The proposition to create Peers, as well as the determination not to alter one single portion of the Bill, was in strict accordance with the demand of *The Times*—a journal which, it would seem, would not suffer or permit the slightest modification of the Bill: nay, he (the Earl of Carnarvon) much doubted if it would permit even the Ministers themselves to rectify even a clerical mistake. The Ministry dared not suffer the slightest alteration in the Bill. The Opposition had been asked whether it was worth their while longer to continue their war against the Bill; but Ministers asked no such questions of those persons whom it was their duty to control, not to obey. Ministers dared not rule those whom it was their duty to restrain, and they dared not protect their Lordships in the temperate and calm exercise of their duty. When they gave their Sovereign that advice they quitted the path of error, and took the bolder road of crime. The noble Earl would find, that in that road there was no halting, but on he must proceed. If the noble Earl had already played the part of a Necker he would hereafter be compelled to play the part of a Robespierre, or fall to the ground. [*Laughter.*] He was happy to see noble Lords opposite meet his last observation with a laugh, and trusted they would long enjoy it, and that the course they were pursuing would leave them the power of smiling; but after a careful study of the history of this country for the last forty years, every page had tended the more to convince him of the correctness of his remarks, and of the dangers of the career pursued by his Majesty's Government. He now felt it to be his duty to dispose of the Order of the Day with respect to the Reform Bill, following the example of the noble Earl opposite, whom he should be sorry in other respects to imitate, and should, therefore, move that the Order of the Day for the Committee on the Reform in Parliament Bill be discharged, and thus he would leave it to the noble Lords to do their dirty work themselves.

The Earl of *Mulgrave* observed, that he had expected that the noble Earl who had just sat down—the advocate of conciliation—the would-be step-father of a measure of Reform, would have temperately pursued the task he so prematurely commenced; but he thought the noble Earl was not so much the master of events as he would have their Lordships to believe. He also could not but think, that if the noble Earl had become connected with office, he would have treated the Bill with much more tenderness and kindness. The noble Earl had been also much too eager when, on a preceding evening, he had communicated to their Lordships, that a Government was forming, but not then complete—a declaration not at all in unison with the statement made this day by the noble Duke who was said to be Premier, but who had himself declared he had not taken office at all. If, then, the noble Duke was not Premier of the new Administration to which the noble Earl referred, who was? Perhaps it was the noble Earl himself. The noble Earl had, in the course of the speech which he had just concluded, used the most injudicious of all sarcasms that he could by any possibility raise against his (the Earl of Mulgrave's) noble friend (Earl Grey). He alluded to the observation that his noble friend (Earl Grey) was a Whig, and the inquiry what was he now? The noble Earl opposite was a Member of this House of Parliament at a period when the noble Duke (Wellington) had once before attempted to form an Administration; and though he (the Earl of Mulgrave) had not then a seat in this House, yet he was present when the noble Earl—who made up his want of firmness of purpose by his strength of language—stated something about the "Liverpool worm" not being united, and observed, that the object of the formation of such a Ministry was, not to change principles, but to get two or three honest men into the service of the State, and prevent the "Liverpool worm" from reuniting. This time the noble Earl had tried his hand at the operation; but with the aid of all his cement and sticking-plaister, the "Liverpool worm" was not to be united. If the noble Duke (Wellington) had not left his place, he (the Earl of Mulgrave) would have offered some observations to his ear; and if that noble Duke (the foremost of anti-reformers, had assumed the reins of Government, and come forward with his measure of Reform, he (the Earl of Mulgrave) would have stood up in his place in that House, with the noble Duke's protest in his hand—the noble Duke should have heard it all, paragraph by paragraph, and he doubted not but that noble Duke would have found, that the cheers of those by whom he was surrounded would have become silent, and they would have quailed on that protest being read. He felt confident that the result of all these recent debates, including that of this night, would be, that in a few days, by some means or other, a full and efficient Reform in the Representation of the people would be made, by which alone tranquillity would be restored to the country.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* could not sufficiently admire the address of the noble Earl (Mulgrave), who had waited till the noble Duke (Wellington) left the House—who had waited, he repeated, till the noble Duke left the House—before he commenced an attack, which he had no hesitation in pronouncing one of the most unfair, unjust, and uncourteous attacks ever made by one Peer against another in that House. The noble Lord had made no attack—he did not even mention the name of the noble Duke until after his noble friend left the House, and then it was, that he made that attack to which he did not think it worth his while to reply. The statement that noble Duke had made, reflected as much honour on him as it did disgrace on those pretended friends of the monarchy who had dared to insult their Sovereign by offering him advice which he did not scruple to pronounce highly treasonable, and one which, in other and better times, would have been instantly followed by the impeachment of those who tendered it. The time might yet come when they would be called to the bar of the House to answer for that advice; but, at all events, he had the consolation of knowing, that history would mark them as the destroyers of their country. He did not ascribe motives; that would be disorderly, but he knew that those who had done their best endeavours to ruin their country, would go down with disgrace to posterity.

The Marquis of *Clanricarde* denied that his noble friend (Earl Musgrave) had taken any undue advantage, or acted unfairly towards the noble Duke (Wellington) who had left the House. His noble friend had risen no less than four times to address the House during the presence of the noble Duke, who was present when his noble friend had risen, and who, as their Lordships had met to hear his explanation, it was not too much to suppose would at least have remained in the House. He could not avoid expressing his surprise that the debate of this evening should have turned into an attack upon his Majesty's Ministers, who were at present in so embarrassing a situation. He should not say one word on the conduct of the noble Duke. He would impute motives to no man, but he could not but deplore as a calamity any event by which a public man might be lowered in the estimation of his country. His noble friend (Earl Grey) had held office with honour to himself, with the approbation and love of his country, and with the confidence of his King; he had retired from it still honoured with the kindest expressions from his Sovereign, and with nothing on earth opposed to him but the very party which had so long held office that it thought office its property, though it could not form a Government to succeed that of his noble friend, not because there was any want of ambition among its members, but because they had no stay and support in the country. If his noble friend should again return to office, he was sure it would be with equal honour to himself and satisfaction to the country. When he should leave it, either at the close of his natural or public life, it would be with the mingled feelings of regret, esteem, and gratitude of the nation.

The Earl of *Mulgrave* begged to say, in explanation, after what had fallen from the noble Marquis opposite (Salisbury), that he had carefully abstained from stating so much as he had intended, in consequence of the absence of the noble Duke; and he so expressed himself when he before addressed their Lordships; at the same time, he could not but think it was too much to stop the mouth of any noble Lord because another Member of their Lordships' House chose to leave his place.

The Earl of *Carnarvon*, in explanation, begged to say, that he had confined his observations solely to the subject of a creation of Peers, and he was anxious to be understood as having done so. In answer to the question which had been put to him, as to what he had meant by stating, on a former evening, that a Government was forming, but not yet formed, he could only say, that he was not concerned, nor in any way a party to the formation of such Government, but that, knowing it was necessary to dispose of the Order of the Day for the Committee on the Reform Bill, he had applied to and learned, from what he considered a sufficient authority, that an Administration was forming, and had, therefore, felt it his duty to move the postponement of the question.

Earl *De La Warr* said, he would only make one or two observations on what had fallen from a noble Lord opposite, who had asserted that the chief, if not the only, consolation of the noble Duke, to whom allusion had been so frequently made that night, would be found in the cheers of his friends and supporters. Now he should blush for his country if this were a correct statement. The noble Duke had other and far more satisfactory sources of consolation; and when the delusion and mystification which now prevailed had passed away—that delusion and mystification which it was the tendency of the acts of the noble Lords opposite, ever since they took office up to the present hour, to create—when that delusion and mystification had passed away, as he hoped in God they would ere long—then the actions of the noble Duke would be duly appreciated by the British public. That noble Duke's conduct, in the last three days, had manifested a more perfect devotion to the interests of his Sovereign and of his country than he had even displayed on the field of Waterloo. He could not find language to express the feelings with which he had read the calumnies that had been circulated against that noble Duke; but of this he was well convinced, that they found no echo in the breasts of the respectable and truly thinking part of his countrymen. Let them, however, and here he spoke of all who were on that (the Opposition) side of the House—let them, he would say, in the present perilous situation, he might almost call it the present agony, of the country—let them preserve for themselves this consolation, that, rising superior to selfish considerations, and careless of any but the public interest, they had exerted themselves to the utmost of their power to rescue the State from the dangers by which it was threatened. What had they done that deserved to be visited with blame? They had voted that the first clause of the Bill should be postponed, not rejected; and they had declined to advise their Sovereign to pass the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. Surely they had a right, as independent legislators, to take that step—surely they were bound calmly and deliberately to consider all the provisions of the measure. He should not trouble their Lordships further. He should conclude with simply saying, that he lamented the necessity which compelled him to say a word on the subject to which he had at first referred; but he could not avoid making these few observations, as insinuations had been thrown out in that House, and injurious assertions had been made elsewhere, relative to the noble Duke, of whom he would say—

> "Virtus, repulsæ nescia sordidæ,
> Intaminatis fulget honoribus:
> Nec sumit, aut ponit secures,
> Arbitrio popularis auræ."

The Earl of *Roden* had understood the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey) to have said, that he "would not continue longer in office than he had a reasonable hope to carry this Bill through their Lordships' House unimpaired." He had been anxious to know from whence this "reasonable hope" was to arise. He had considered it to be his duty to oppose the bringing in of the measure, because he firmly believed it would prove destructive to the Constitution of the country; and, therefore, the whole Bill would receive his most decided opposition in all its stages. While he felt it to be a measure of this nature, he thought it right to make a declaration of his opinion. He would prefer its adoption in consequence of the noble Earl's exertion, rather than be in any way a party to it himself. He wished to put this his opinion upon record, and he trusted that, William 4th, the son of George 3rd, would never consent to allow any Minister to swamp their Lordships' House, by the creation of a large number of Peers, for the purpose of carrying a particular measure.

The motion "That the Order of the Day for going into Committee on the Reform Bill be discharged" was then agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Thursday, May 17, 1832.

MINUTES.] Bill. Read a second time. On the Motion of Viscount DUNCANNON, Regent's Park Acts Amendment.

Petitions presented. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from Folkestone, for Commuting the Punishment of Death for Crimes against Property unattended by personal violence.—By Mr. CHARLES GRANT, from Singapore, for a Local Independent Court of Judicature; and from Inverness, for Relief for the West-India interest.—By Mr. SHAW, from Brinny, and three other places in Ireland, against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland.)—By Mr. TREVOR, from Ormskirk, and from Reading, against the Beer Act.—By the LORD ADVOCATE, from Cupar, in favour of the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland.)

REFORM — WITHHOLDING THE SUPPLIES.] Colonel *Torrens* presented a Petition from the inhabitants of Great and Little Bolton, praying the House to withhold the Supplies until the Reform Bill should have become a law. He had, on former occasions, advocated the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of Bolton; and on the present occasion he need not say much to induce the House to give to this petition its best consideration. There was not a town to be found in the kingdom where a greater progress had been made within the last few years, in wealth, population, and intelligence, than Bolton. This petition had emanated from a simultaneous meeting, collected not by artifice or contrivance, but by a spontaneous feeling generally pervading that great town. On hearing the news which disappointed their best hopes respecting Reform, so strong was that feeling that a meeting immediately took place, and this petition was proposed, considered, carried, and signed by 20,300 individuals in two or three hours. This was only an indication of the spirit which prevailed generally throughout the kingdom: it was the indication of a spirit which showed that the supporters of the cause of Reform were rapidly on the increase, and were alive to the subject. The petitioners had heard with dismay that the former Government had withdrawn from office, and were to be replaced by Ministers, the known and declared opposers of the measure of Reform. They declared that nothing but Reform of the most extensive description would satisfy them; and he was convinced that nothing but the carrying the measure which had passed that House, without alteration or delay, could or would avert the imminent danger with which, at present, this country was threatened. The petitioners also expressed their ardent hope, that a Reform founded on the principles of Universal Suffrage would be granted, which would give to all classes of the people in this country equal rights and equal privileges; they considered the Bill, as introduced by his Majesty's Ministers, a measure by which those privileges would be restored of which they had been, by degrees, deprived. Here he did not agree with them; but this petition showed what would be the inevitable consequence of the passing of the great Bill being delayed any further; for it was the rejection of the Bill which had induced these petitioners to go further in their prayer than they otherwise would have done. It showed to the House how much the occurrences of the last few days had excited the feelings of the people, and that disappointment had given to their ideas a new direction. With that part of the petition which prayed for the stoppage of the Supplies, so far as it was applicable to the measure which had passed the House, he most fully concurred; but he hoped that arrangements would be speedily made for the return of Ministers to their official duties, with full powers to carry that measure. This would immediately have the effect of suppressing the present angry feelings of the country, and restore that harmony amongst the people which was at present so dangerously and seriously interrupted. He must say, that if, by any misfortune, an interference should take place to defeat the principles of the Reform Bill, it would destroy the confidence of the country in the beneficial tendency of that measure; and, would induce the people to demand other, and more extensive measures, tending in their results to revolutionary acts, and revolutionary proceedings, the extent of which could not be calculated. It was extraordinary that any person should possess so disordered an imagination, as to conceive that it was now possible to deny to the people a measure of Reform less efficient than that which had passed that House; if such a person existed, he was fit to become a resident at St. Luke's or Bedlam, rather than to take his seat in that or in the other House of Parliament.

Mr. *Hunt* had been requested by the men of Bolton to support the prayer of this petition, and he would do so, although he was not a candidate for the Representation of that town. Twenty thousand of that intelligent and brave people had signed the petition in a few hours. He would relate an anecdote illustrative of the good temper and spirit of the people of Bolton. He was addressing about 15,000 of them just about the time that the Bishops were in bad odour, shortly after the caution given them by Lord Grey to "put their houses in order," a caution, by the way, which was enforced by a mob burning a Bishop's palace very shortly after. He was just in the middle of his address to the people of Bolton, when the carriage of the Bishop of Chester happened to come suddenly amongst them. He advised them to open a road for the carriage, and upon no account to be guilty of the dastardly cowardice of attacking a single individual. A passage was accordingly made by these brave men, and the Bishop passed without a single insult being directed towards him, still less an attack. He stated this to show that the men of Bolton were not easily to be led astray, and to show that they were not like the people of the parish of St. Bride's, who assaulted a Bishop when he was in the pulpit, and about to preach a charity sermon. For his part, he was for stopping the Supplies, in accordance with the prayer of the petition altogether. This ought to have been done long ago. If the late Administration were to come in again, he was afraid they would not be for stopping the Supplies, but he would be for that course, whether the Whig faction or the Tory faction were at the head of the Government. Until they had good and cheap Government he would adopt this course. He had no confidence in either faction. In the Whig faction he could have no confidence, after having settled 100,000*l.* a year on the Queen, a personage who, a week ago, was cried up by the Whigs as an angel, and now, in one week, was cried down by them as almost the reverse of an angel. This was a sample of the costliness of monarchy. In America it was very different. He did not mean to say he was for a Republic altogether, but if they could not otherwise have cheap government, then he would declare that he was for a Republic.

Mr. *Robert Ferguson* trusted that the House would grant a short indulgence to one of the Members from Scotland on such a momentous occasion as this, in which the interests of that country were, perhaps, more deeply involved than any other part of the empire. He naturally took an opportunity, in such a crisis, of communicating his feelings and the feelings of those with whom he was more immediately connected; and he would assure the House that he did not indulge in hopes, or in slumbering expectation for the success of Reform, but that he was certain that the people must obtain it, whatever Administration might be in power. He would recommend the people to pursue a steady, determined, tranquil line of conduct, to respect the laws, and fear not to stand by the House of Commons, and the House would not fail to stand by them, and bestow upon them their privileges through constitutional means. But this advice was not even necessary; the people knew it must be so; the people of Scotland were too loyal, too intelligent, to resort to violence, unless driven to despair; and they would wait with confidence in the firm expectation that they were soon to enjoy their constitutional rights through constitutional means. Not a day, not an hour, if possible, should be lost in letting the people know that their wishes were to be granted, so that the industry and the peace of the country might be saved from a violent shock. This was not the expression of a headstrong, short-sighted, and riotous mob, but of the united feelings and energies of the great mass of an enlightened people.

Petition to be printed.

THE ADMINISTRATION.] Mr. Phillips presented a Petition from the Inhabitants of the Town and neighbourhood of Loughborough, praying the House to stop the Supplies until the Reform Bill should have passed into a law.

Mr. *Paget* supported the petition. He assured the House that the great body of the people in the county of Leicester participated in the sentiments of that petition, and looked with the utmost anxiety to the return of the late Ministry to office. Indeed, he hoped that the House would hear that evening that the Gentlemen who composed the late Administration were the present Ministers. He hoped that the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), whom he then saw in his place, had come down prepared to inform the House and the country, that the present state of the negotiations between his Majesty and the colleagues of the noble Lord was such as to give satisfaction to the country.

Lord *Althorp:* I will answer, as far as I can, the question of the hon. Gentleman. On a former evening I stated to the House that my noble friend, Earl Grey, had received a communication from his Majesty, and it was on that ground I suggested that it would be a convenient course for the House to adjourn over to this day. I am not prepared at this moment to say that any arrangements consequent upon that communication have been completed; but I hope that I may go so far as to state, that there is a probability that a satisfactory arrangement will take place. In the meantime, I trust that the House and the country will place this much confidence in the late Administration—not to suppose that we would return to office unless we were perfectly assured that we should be able to carry the Reform Bill through without any alteration in its essential and main principles.

Lord *Ebrington* trusted that he might congratulate the House and the country on the explanation which had been given by the noble Lord. After that explanation he could have little doubt that the arrangements which were in progress would be brought to a satisfactory, and, he hoped, to a speedy conclusion. He could not bring his mind to contemplate the possibility of a disappointment to the hopes of the country on this subject. He was happy to hear what had fallen from the noble Lord, and he was sure that the House and the country had the fullest confidence that the noble Lord and his colleagues would be parties to no arrangement which should not secure the carrying of the Reform Bill, untouched in all its principles, and in all its essential provisions. He had the most anxious hopes that the noble Lord would speedily be able to inform the House; that the arrangements now in progress were brought to a satisfactory conclusion; for although the announcement of Earl Grey in the other House of Parliament had had the effect of calming, to a great extent, the dreadful excitement which, until yesterday, agitated the country; yet the country would not be restored to tranquillity until it should have received the assurance that an arrangement for the return of the late Ministers to office had been concluded. He did not mean to say, that it would be necessary that all the details of the arrangement should be made known; for he believed that it would be sufficient to tranquillise the public mind, if the noble Lord was able to say, generally, that the arrangement was concluded. The confidence of the country in the noble Lord and his colleagues was now greater than ever, in consequence of their conduct upon a late occasion. Still, he would again press upon the noble Lord how important it was, that the arrangement should have been brought to a conclusion, and that it would not only give the Ministers the power to pass the Bill, but the power to pass it without delay.

Petition to be printed.

Mr. *O'Connell,* in presenting a petition from a parish in the county of Limerick, for the immediate and total abolition of Tithes, stated, that he had petitions to present similar to that which had been presented by the hon. member for Ashburton, (Colonel Torrens), and amongst them one from Birmingham, which expressed the sentiments of 100,000 persons who were assembled at the meeting at which the petition was agreed to.

Sir *John Wrottesley* said, that it was with mingled feelings of satisfaction and regret, he had heard the explanation of the noble Lord below him. He was much gratified to hear that there was a strong probability that the noble Lord and his colleagues would return to office; but his satisfaction was in a great degree checked by the statement that the arrangements were still uncompleted. He had received a petition from Wolverhampton, expressing, in very strong terms, the sentiments of the people respecting the course which their constituents wished that House to adopt in the present crisis. But in consequence of what had fallen from the noble Lord, he should postpone the presentation of that petition. At the same time he wished to call the attention of the House to a subject deeply interesting to humanity. The neighbourhood from which he had received the petition to which he had alluded was populous; and the greater part of the dense population depended upon their daily labour for their daily bread. In consequence of the situation of public affairs, a vast number of those people were thrown out of employment, and were in a state of the utmost destitution; and if measures were not taken to put an end to the stagnation of trade, and the want of confidence throughout the country, the people would be driven to acts which, without the excitement of the most galling distress, they would not be capable of committing.

Mr. *Portman* had also a petition to present on the same subject, from the county which he represented; but he thought that it was better not to present it after what he had heard from the noble Lord, lest he should in any way interfere with the arrangements which were in progress.

Mr. *Robinson* said, that he also had a petition to present, agreed to at a meeting of 10,000 persons, being the largest meeting that ever was held in the county of Worcester, but he would postpone the presentation, for the same reason as had been given by other hon. Members for adopting that course.

Mr. *Warburton* had several petitions to present from places in the county of Dorset, but for the same reason he should postpone them.

Lord *Ashley* said, that he had not heard of the meetings at which, as the hon. member for Bridport stated, those petitions had been agreed to.

Mr. *Portman* took the earliest opportunity of informing the House and the noble Lord, that he had that morning received communications from several parts of the county of Dorset, where meetings had been held, and petitions agreed to, similar to those of which other Gentlemen had postponed the presentation. He was sorry that the noble Lord, as a county Member, was not better informed of what was going on in his own county.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that Mr. Portman pledged himself upon the hustings, at the time of his election, to resign his seat in the event of Lord Ashley's being returned as his colleague. Now, he begged to ask the hon. Gentleman, whether he intended to redeem his pledge?

Mr. *Portman* said, he was perfectly willing to give an answer to the question, if the House thought proper. It would give him pleasure to be allowed to do so. He had made no such declaration on the hustings as that alluded to by the hon. Member. He had, however, made a private communication to the noble Lord, in which he had expressed himself in language not proper to be used if the communication were intended to be made public.

In that communication he had stated, that, if the noble Lord succeeded in making the county appear to be a weathercock county, he would give the freeholders an opportunity of choosing another Tory candidate. When the Committee of that House decided in favour of Lord Ashley, whatever some people might imagine, he thought he was called upon to keep the pledge contained in his private communication, and he accordingly tendered his resignation; but the county, by a requisition, begged of him not to hazard the peace of the county by resigning at such a time. The hon. Member did not know him as well as others, or the hon. Member would have been aware that he should have been pleased at being released from his parliamentary labours, in order that he might attend to duties which were to him far more agreeable. He begged, however, to say, that personally he had not any objection to act with the noble Lord as a colleague.

Lord *Ashley* did not think it necessary to trouble the House with a full explanation of his conduct in the affair thus brought under discussion, as he had already submitted it to the fullest consideration of the gentlemen of the county which he had the honour to represent, and, by their sentence in his favour, he considered he was fully supported in the view he had taken and acted upon. He wished, however, to explain one thing. He had previously written to his hon. friend, who was an old college friend of his, upon the subject of the election. That letter was strictly of a private nature. He believed it began—"My dear Jack." At all events he had written in those familiar terms which his ancient college friendship dictated. He then got the answer of his hon. friend, in which he said—"I cannot consent to sit as Member for the county if you are returned." He got this letter very late, immediately before the commencement of the election, and he had no time to lose. His hon. friend spoke of giving the county "the pleasure of another election" if he should be returned. He saw no reason for considering it a private communication when he was saddled with the whole responsibility of exposing the county to a second election. He had no right to conceal this fact. He was determined to have it explained, and he, therefore, immediately placed it in the hands of his friends, and waited for their determination to choose his course.

Mr. *Portman* rose in explanation. He had only declared that he would not sit as Representative for the county of Dorset with the noble Lord as his colleague, if it proved itself to be a weathercock county. This was not the guarded language of a public document; and, with regard to the noble Lord's assertion, that he did not consider the letter a private communication, he referred him to the first sentence of that letter, which would at once show that he considered the letter as private. In the first sentence of his letter he referred to a previous correspondence in the month of May. He was, at the time, only twenty-six miles distant from his noble friend, and thought he ought to have been consulted by his noble friend before he made his letter public.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* begged leave to confirm the statement of the hon. member for Dorsetshire. It was only at the request of a large number of the freeholders that the hon. Gentleman retained his seat.

Mr. *Hume* had expected that he should have been able to discharge the Order for the Call of the House on Friday, and that the expectations of the country would be realised by the recall of the Ministers to office, with power to carry the Reform Bill in a perfect state. He had been present the day before yesterday, at, perhaps, the most numerous meeting he had ever seen—certainly the most unanimous—and the universal desire was, that the entire measure of Reform should be carried. He was quite satisfied that, if Ministers allowed themselves to yield one jot of the Bill, instead of receiving credit for what they had done, they would severely disappoint the well-founded expectations of the people. Of course he did not refer to trifling alterations, but to essential points; and he should be most happy—as happy as any man in the House—if it could be carried with comparatively little opposition. It was, however, too much for the country to be kept in a state of suspense like that at present existing; and Ministers, in justice to the zeal and anxiety expressed by the people, ought to be as explanatory as possible upon the subject, in order that the people might act accordingly. If no additional and explicit assurance could be given—although he might be sorry to give hon. Gentlemen the trouble of attending to-morrow—he would not withdraw his notice for calling over the House; as every man ought to be at his post, prepared, if it must come, for disappointment.

He would sit down, without saying more than to express his regret that such an impediment or hitch should have occurred in any quarter.

Mr. *John Wood* should not have risen even to mention the petitions sent to him, but for the remark of the noble Lord (the member for Dorsetshire), who said that he could answer for it, that, in one county, at least, there was not by any means a unanimous feeling in favour of Reform. If such were the case in Dorsetshire, he believed that was the only province of the United Kingdom which still submitted to be ruled by a boroughmongering faction. He advised the noble Lord to make a tour into the north of England, in order that he might become acquainted with the spirit universally prevailing there. He had been intrusted with petitions from various parts of Lancashire, and especially from Manchester and Preston, and in those districts the anxious expectations of the people were raised to the highest possible point; and he could testify that it would be most dangerous to disappoint those expectations by deferring the Bill. The people would consider that their fondest hopes were destroyed, if, after the Ministers were restored, they did not, in a manner consistent with their lives and characters, carry the Reform Bill unmutilated.

Mr. *Heywood* observed, that he also should abstain from presenting petitions transmitted to him. In no county of England was the feeling in favour of Reform more intense than in Lancashire; the inhabitants were most materially suffering from the delay, and disappointment might be attended with fatal consequences.

Colonel *Lindsay* thought it would be better if hon. Gentlemen on the other side would pause and examine the precise circumstances of the case. The object of the Bill was, to destroy the influence of the Peers in the House of Commons; it had been passed in that House, and because, when it arrived in the House of Lords, one part was only postponed to another, although the principle of Reform was admitted, Ministers had thought proper to call upon the King to create sixty or seventy Peers, in order that the measure might be carried; not only the principle, but the whole of the details. The noble Earl at the head of the Ministry had already made thirty-one Peers, and yet, while he objected to nominee Members of the House of Commons, he wished to make sixty or seventy base, vassal nominees, to whom he was to issue his order that the Reform Bill should be carried. Was there justice, probity, or principle, in such a proceeding? He regretted the vote passed some nights ago, and he apprehended that posterity would stare with astonishment, when they found that by it the House of Commons had justified the creation of 101 nominee Peers, for the purpose of carrying the Reform Bill.

Lord *Althorp:* I undoubtedly thought that, by common consent, under the circumstances of which the House is apprised, it was agreed not to be desirable to enter into a discussion on the subject. I must, however, beg to state to the hon. Gentleman, if he does not see what every other Member must see, and what the whole country does see, that the question in the House of Lords was not, as he assumes, a mere question of detail, but a question which materially affected the principle of the Bill. After the late decision, Ministers could not attempt, consistently with their own pledged honour, to carry the Bill through the Committee of the other House. It is, therefore, vain to say, that it was only a trifling question of detail. How was it argued? Was it argued as a trifling question of detail? Certainly not. We always put the principle of the Bill upon this—that nomination boroughs were an evil that must be got rid of, and yet the clauses for their abolition were to be postponed to the enfranchising clauses. No person who knew the effect of the division, could doubt for a moment that it was not possible for Ministers, with honour, to carry the Bill further.

Mr. *Baring:* I hope that the observation of the hon. Member, under the circumstances, may be allowed to pass without further reply, in order that the discussion may stop here. Whatever may be the anxieties, and there are none greater than my own, hon. Members must be sensible that, in the course of the arrangements to which the noble Lord has referred, nothing can tend more to embarrass, and do injury, than the prolongation of this discussion. If it be continued, of course it will be impossible for me and other Members to remain silent, but I entreat the House to let the subject drop here. I only beg to be allowed to make a single observation, not likely to provoke controversy, but to remove an impression which has pervaded the country, and in some degree this House. I am not authorized to speak for any body, but I think it just to say, on the part of his Majesty — if on his Majesty's part I may be permitted to say it, and it is due to him that the country should know—that at no one period did I ever understand, as, indeed, I said on a former occasion, that it was the King's intention, in the slightest degree to vary from the pledge he had given to the country, or to form an Administration which would not carry the efficient principles of Reform. I state distinctly that to be the fact. It is competent to all to throw as much opprobrium as they please upon those who might be disposed to enter the King's Councils in the face of such a pledge. I have ventured very humbly to contend, that it might be done with honour and consistency; but, whatever slur is applicable to the advisers of the King, in no part of the negotiation can it be said that there was the slightest departure by his Majesty from the pledges he had given.

Sir *Robert Price* observed, that, during the discussion, not a word had been said against his Majesty or the Queen. He should refrain from presenting a petition he had received, but he could assert, that, even in his quiet part of the country, the deepest interest prevailed.

Mr. *Hunt* remarked, that, in some parts of the metropolis, people had talked of sending a certain family to Hanover. It was but justice to the King, that what had fallen from the hon. member for Thetford should be known.

Mr. *Curteis* referred to a meeting on the Steyne, at Brighton, attended, as was asserted, by 10,000 persons. He had received a petition, signed by 2,000 names, the presentation of which he should delay until a more convenient time.

Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, May 18, 1832.

MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS—EXPLANATIONS.] The Archbishop of *York* was anxious to say a few words upon some circumstances personal, to himself, connected with the proceedings on the Reform Bill. The violence and excitement which prevailed in the Debate last night (if debate it could be called) which followed the declaration of a noble Duke not now in the House—a violence and excitement which, during the forty years he had had the honour of a seat in that House, he had never before witnessed—and God forbid he should live to witness the same again—unnerved him to such a degree, that he really had not power to address their Lordships. In these times, when the conduct of public men was so unsparingly assailed—when they were industriously and mischievously subjected to the grossest misrepresentation and falsehood, he felt it necessary to say a few words in explanation of the view he had taken on the question, and the course he intended to adopt in the further proceedings upon it. When the former Reform Bill was before their Lordships, in the course of the last Session, he was necessarily prevented from attending by the interference of various duties which he had to discharge in Yorkshire at that particular time—duties which he ever had regarded as of paramount importance to every other duty which a Bishop might, in his legislative capacity, be called upon to perform; for when either the interests of religion or the rights of the clergy were affected, he felt himself bound to make them the immediate object of his consideration. But if he had happened to be present on that occasion, he certainly should have voted for the second reading of the Reform Bill, and simply on this principle, that it was a Bill applying directly to the constitution of the other House, and had been sent up to their Lordships by a large majority of that House, and that the preponderance of political opinion was greatly in its favour; and, moreover, that the object for which the Bill proposed to provide had received the approbation of the Crown. He should, then, have voted for the second reading of the Bill, upon the plain principle, that the provisions of any measure, so sent up and so advocated, were entitled to the fullest consideration of their Lordships. On the same ground, and for the same reasons, did he give his vote for the second reading of the Bill now on the Table, and this with the sincere view of supporting in the Committee the three great principles of the Bill—enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and an extension of the right of suffrage. Let it not be supposed that, by the order in which he expressed these principles, he was the less prepared to support disfranchisement in the fullest extent; but, in his view of the case, he had ever considered that the true and proper ground for disfranchisement was the necessity of enfranchisement. And as it was determined not to add to the number of the House of Commons, enfranchisement must necessarily be followed by a proportional amount of disfranchisement. Therefore was it that, when the Bill was in Committee, he had voted consistently with the opinions he entertained, not at all anticipating the effect to which a decision of the House in accordance with that vote had led. He trusted that the noble Earl would give him full credit for this declaration. As to the propriety of an extensive enfranchisement, the connection he had had for a period of twenty-four years with the great manufacturing towns in Yorkshire, afforded him abundant opportunity of being convinced of its expediency. He alluded to Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield, and Bradford; all of which places, from their population, wealth, and intelligence, were fit to be intrusted with the elective franchise: and this, of which he so much approved, would be done by the Bill. He would only trouble their Lordships with a very few words more, and on a subject personal to himself, of which he was sure their Lordships would regret to hear. He had that morning received a letter from the Lord Mayor of York, announcing to him that he had felt it necessary to call in the aid of the military to preserve his (the Archbishop's) house and property at Bishopsthorpe, which had been assailed by a lawless mob assembled there on Wednesday evening, whose object was, undoubtedly, to effect the destruction of both. In consequence of the Lord Mayor's prompt exertions, little mischief had been committed; and, when he wrote at two o'clock in the morning, the military were stationed in the house and stables. Now, he believed there was no other cause for this attack but that he had been unfortunate enough, conscientiously to think that enfranchisement should precede disfranchisement. He thought it further necessary to state, that but for the circumstances to which he had already alluded, this declaration of his would have been made last night, and, consequently, before he had received the intelligence which reached him in that letter. He, therefore, trusted the House would not imagine he was influenced to make that declaration by what had taken place.

The Duke of *Rutland*, after apologising for trespassing on their Lordships' time, said, that he would not now take the liberty of addressing them, if he did not think that, in the present posture of affairs, the individual opinions of every Peer ought to be, if possible, recorded, and sent down to the latest posterity, for good or evil, on the page of our country's history. He considered that the crisis had arrived when the boasted stability of our Constitution should rise superior to the influence of misguided policy and popular violence. Much of the future prosperity of the empire was identified with the circumstances of the present moment. He had attended most anxiously to the declarations made by his noble friends, the illustrious Duke and the noble and learned Baron, last night, and, after hearing them, his mind was deeply impressed with two considerations — unmeasureable gratitude to the gracious Prince now upon the Throne, who, in a moment of more trying difficulty than had, perhaps, ever yet been experienced by Sovereigns, had displayed a firmness and decision which proved him a worthy member of the illustrious race from which he sprung. There was wanting only the utterance of one monosyllable, and their Lordships' House had ceased to be a deliberative assembly. He, therefore, begged to express his humble gratitude to his Majesty, and to observe, that, at all events, let the consequences be what they might, the evening of his Majesty's days would be cheered by the proud recollection of having acted as he did. May the close of that illustrious Prince's life be like the evening of a Midsummer-day, that glides away in pleasantness and serenity. The next feeling he had entertained was a sense of the greatest admiration of the conduct of the noble Duke. He could not but feel the greatest admiration when he reflected on that noble Duke's conduct, and considered the obloquy to which he had been exposed by his patriotic attempt again to serve an ungrateful country. It would be the natural desire of the noble Duke, after all the time he had devoted to the service of his country, to seek repose, in the evening of his days, in a happy home; but the noble Duke saw the manner in which the Crown was assailed—he did not hesitate to forego his own repose, and brave even public obloquy, to preserve the independence of the Crown and of the Legislature. Under all those circumstances, he could not but feel the utmost admiration at the conduct of his noble and illustrious friend. He would now state, in the face of their Lordships and the country, what he had often and often stated in private, that there was no man in the kingdom whose opinions, if he had not an opinion of his own, he would so unhesitatingly adopt and engraft upon his mind as the opinions of his noble friend, whose late conduct had only confirmed his confidence, and strengthened his disposition to rely on his noble friend. On the subject of the Bill itself he wished to observe, that, although he opposed it, he did not mean to arraign the motives of those who introduced it. He would not deny that they might be honourable, pure, patriotic. It was not their motives, but their measure, he condemned. He could assure the House, that to a temperate and judicious measure of Reform he should not be opposed. He was opposed to the first Reform Bill, because its consequences, he conceived, would be mainly to affect the great institutions of the country. He had compared the present Bill with the former, and he saw no material alteration in it which should induce him to give his support to the one rather than to the other. He conceived that, by an extensive grant of political power to classes which had never before enjoyed it, and by depriving others of that power who had enjoyed it for centuries—by the destruction of vested rights, and the summoning of other rights arbitrarily into existence, a fatal change would be made in our constitutional policy, and consequences would ensue, the dread extent of which no human sagacity could foresee. He was far from denying to the people their just right of assembling together for the purpose of expressing their honest opinions on any point connected with the public good; and, moreover, he firmly believed there was not on the face of the globe a nation possessing more good sense and discrimination than the British nation; but he doubted whether the assemblies to which he alluded were capable of discussing, in a temperate and useful manner, those points to which they now addressed themselves, at a time when popular excitement prevailed, and when those classes were led astray by the acts of designing people, who had objects very different from the ostensible ones they set forth. He believed, that although the tone and temper in which the discussions were carried on in these assemblies were highly reprehensible, yet he considered that the same feverish agitation did not now exist throughout the country as at the period when the original Reform Bill was debated. The country was then in such a state—he meant in October—that the greatest misery which could happen to the country would have been the passing of such a measure. Certain was he that the future historian of our land might accurately describe the state of public feeling in our country in words such as those applied by a beautiful historian of old to the state of public feeling in Rome at the close of the first Jugurthine war. "Sed plebes, incredibile memoratu est, quantum intenta fuerit quantaque vi rogationem jusserit, decreverit, voluerit, magis odio nobilitatis cui mala illa parabantur, quam curâ reipublicæ—tanta lubido in partibus erat." It was some consolation that the measure was not passed at that period. Still he apprehended great danger from the discordant interests it would create, and which it would be so difficult to reconcile, and which, he feared, would lay the foundation of interminable discontent. He was ashamed to detain their Lordships so long, when he knew it was his duty to economise their time as much as possible. But before he resumed his seat, he was anxious to express the warmest admiration of the conduct of the House during the time this arduous subject had been before them. He had ever been proud that his lot had been so cast in life as to have given him the honour of sitting among their Lordships; and if such had been his opinion during his whole life, how much greater must it be now, when he had witnessed the conduct of that House under circumstances of such infinite embarrassment? It put him in mind of an anecdote in ancient history. When Saturnius, a Tribune of the Roman people, proposed a law for the division of lands taken from the Cimbri, he introduced a clause enacting that the Senate should swear to confirm whatever the people should decree. The law passed the Comitiæ by a large majority, and the Senate were called upon to swear to its observance. All consented except Metellus, who refused, stating that "to do wrong was always base: to do right when there was no danger was common; but to do right, when it was attended with danger was deserving of all honour." He knew that he was addressing a Senate in which the character of Metellus was the leading feature. Their Lordships, in dealing with that momentous question, had kept the even tenour of their way, unmoved, upon the one hand, by fear of popular clamour, and unseduced, on the other hand by the meed of popular applause. The House had not been deluded by the hope of that giddy approbation which changed its objects before its acclamations had subsided into silence. It might spread its gaudy pinions, and shed down its meretricious light upon the tenants of the opposite benches; but the majority of the House were well content to hold their way undazzled by its specious splendor. Their Lordships had shown in their conduct that they were guided only by two considerations—the maintenance of our noble Constitution and the real interests of the country. So might always be that House disposed, was his fervent prayer. In conclusion he must express, however feebly he felt any such hope, that the Bill would realise the expectations of those who had brought it in, and that it might promote the good of the country.

The Earl of *Harewood:* My Lords, I fear I am about to be guilty of some indiscretion; but I am going to put a question to the noble Earl opposite, on the answer to which depends the course I shall pursue. My Lords, when we separated yesterday evening, it was understood, that another Ministry had not been formed. On that subject I should wish to address the House; but, before I proceed to do so, I will await the answer of the noble Earl to the question I am about to put. I do not ask it in any spirit of hostility, but merely for the purpose of satisfying myself and those who seem to be uninformed on the subject. I, therefore, ask the noble Earl, whether those negotiations have been brought to an end, and in what position he stands with regard to his Majesty's Administration?

Earl *Grey* said, he was always as much as possible desirous, in answer to any proper question, to furnish as much information as was in his power, and more especially when a question was put in so courteous a manner. Certainly, if the noble Earl had not applied to him, he should have been prepared to state to their Lordships the result, he would not say of the negotiations, for he was not aware that he had ever used that word, but of the communications which had taken place between his Majesty and himself since he had given up the Seals, and since the noble Duke had retired from the office he had felt it his duty to undertake. He had the satisfaction of informing the House, that those communications had been brought to this result—that, in consequence of his Majesty's desire, graciously expressed to him, and in consequence of his seeing now those grounds of confident expectation that enabled him to consider his pledge to the House, last night, of not continuing in the Administration without sufficient security for passing the Reform Bill, now on the Table, unimpaired in all its principles and all its essential provisions; and, in consequence of his now finding himself in a position, that such might be his confident anticipation; and in consequence of his having received his Majesty's commands, graciously expressed, his Majesty's present Ministers would continue in their places. Having now answered the question of the noble Earl, he would allude to nothing that was past. He felt, in common with the right reverend Prelate, deep regret and much distress at the tone of the debate last night; but he thought he could throw himself upon the House, and confidently say, that he had done nothing to provoke the asperity which was displayed. He would appeal to the House, whether he had not, however, last night, been exposed to a series of personal attacks, and to language which was not usual in their Lordships' House? And he could appeal to the House, whether, in the attempt to vindicate himself, he had been betrayed into anything which could be characterized by personal violence, or improper feeling? With the consciousness that he had not, he would let the subject drop; and he did trust, that the fever of feeling which now prevailed would subside into calmness. He felt the necessity that the measure should be conducted with calmness, to avoid furnishing fresh materials for irritation abroad; he felt, also, that that measure, by which he trusted the people would be restored to contentment, ought to be brought to a speedy conclusion. To these objects his efforts would be directed, with the same spirit and feeling as before; and he trusted he might look forward to a period, when this question would be settled, and all those heats and animosities would have subsided, and there would be a renewal of those means of prosperity which the country so abundantly possessed, and which only wanted political Reform to be developed. It was his intention—and he thought he might as well do it then, as there was no business before the House—he would accordingly move, that the Order for the Committee on the Reform Bill should be renewed for Monday next.

The Earl of *Harewood* said, as he had informed their Lordships, what he had to say would depend on the answer of the noble Earl, and as he observed, by that answer, that the noble Earl and his colleagues were reinstated in office, he felt, that he was called upon to say a few words, declaratory of the course which it was proper for him individually to pursue. In so doing, he begged it to be understood, that he was acting altogether for himself, and without communion or connexion with any one else. The House had been given to understand, that the continuance in office of the noble Lord and his colleagues depended on the powers they should obtain to carry the Reform Bill, among which was that of the creation of Peers. In the situation in which public affairs then stood—in the situation in which that House particularly was placed—it became necessary, that he, as an individual Member of it, should look forward to see how to guide his conduct. He owned, that he deeply lamented the determination to which he believed Ministers would resort, to carry their measure of Reform, because, if the exercise of that alternative should take place, he saw, that there was an end to the independence of that House; to the independence, if not to the extinction of the Crown; and to the independence—he said it emphatically and sincerely—of the freedom of the subject. Such being the conviction of his mind, he should hesitate, by continuing his individual opposition to the Reform Bill, to add his mite to the necessity of overturning for ever the Constitution of the country. He had opposed the measure upon the second reading, because he considered it much too extensive for the necessity of the case. In Committee he had declared how far he should support it, and had pointed out where he should feel bound to oppose it. But, in consequence of the division which then took place, a different state of things ensued, and Ministers declared, that that House should not have the opportunity of amending that; or, if their policy were acted upon, any other measure that might be laid before it. In that condition were they now placed; and he maintained, that the act by which they were so placed was one of gross injustice and oppression towards that House. But what was he to do? How was he to meet the circumstances by which he was embarrassed? Was he, on his own individual behalf, to do that which would assist in bringing on the country a greater calamity? He thought, that the alterations which he wished to see introduced into the Bill were minor considerations, when compared with the mischief which must result from the means to which Ministers would resort to resist them. Upon that account, as he had already stated a few days since to a noble Earl, with whom he had some conversation upon the subject, he had determined to adopt what appeared to him to be the milder of the two alternatives which were left open to him, namely, that of withholding further opposition to the Bill. He preferred to do this rather than to incur what he regarded as a greater calamity—the infusion into that House of a large body of new Peers. Over that he had no control.

Earl *Grey:* I beg to say one word—[*cries of " no, no."*]

The Earl of *Harewood:* It was understood, from the noble Earl's statement, that he was to have the power of carrying the Bill. Well, then, if he (Lord Harewood) were to advert in any way to the circumstance of power, he should say that the power of which the noble Earl spoke, consisted in the creation of Peers. That being so, and meaning, as, under the circumstances of the case he certainly did mean, to withhold further opposition to the Bill, for fear of the greater calamity which he had mentioned, he preferred to get up in that House, and state openly to their Lordships what he intended to do, rather than to state it any where else, or not to state it at all. Having said this—having pointed out the line which he intended to pursue, he begged to add, that he only adopted that line by compulsion—by a compulsion operating so strongly upon him, that he looked upon it that this was the last time that he should have an opportunity of uttering one word in that House as an independent Member of it. Bidding farewell, then, to what he called the freedom of debate, he said, let those who brought this infliction upon them—he spoke this not in anger, but in sorrow—let those, he said, who brought this infliction upon the country, be responsible for their acts to the nation, when it shall have recovered its senses. But, for his own part, he would not, if he could help it, for the sake of the slight alterations which his opposition might effect in the Bill, longer impede the return of the country to its senses, which, he believed, would not be the case until the measure of Reform was carried. With this determination for the future he must defend his conduct for the past. When they were called upon to change the Constitution of the country, were they to be stigmatized as blameable because they hesitated or disapproved? He maintained, that the opponents of the measure of Reform had given nothing more than a fair and reasonable opposition to it; he would say more —he knew that the Bill had been brought up to that House by a majority of the House of Commons? What then? Did that imply—he knew it did technically, and by the rules of the House—but, he would ask, did it, in fact, imply that the House of Commons fully approved and acquiesced in the Bill? If it did, he could only say, that he had not communicated with a single individual who had assisted in passing it through the other House of Parliament, who, in his own private opinion, entirely approved of it. He would even go further, and, in spite of all the earnestness evinced by the noble Earl and his colleagues to carry this measure, he would ask, although he supposed he should receive no answer, if the subject of Reform were again to come fresh into their hands, they would propose such a Bill as that now upon the Table? If any answer were given to him, he knew it would be—"Yes;" but such an answer he was not bound to believe. He felt persuaded, that such a measure would not again be proposed; and, therefore, he was the more hurt at the means which were now resorted to for the purpose of carrying it. Were the measure one which was firmly, honestly, and conscientiously approved of by those who had supported it in the other House, and of those who proposed it in that House, he should not so much have minded the course which the noble Earl had expressed his determination to pursue; but when a new Constitution was put upon the country, which was considered by many, even of its supporters, to have weak places, he owned that he looked with trepidation and dismay to the manner in which it might work upon the interest and welfare of the nation. God grant that it might work well—that it might be good for the country—and that he and those who opposed it might be deceived in their anticipations of its results.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* felt, that the independence of their Lordships' House ceased from that night; because he was satisfied, that the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government would not have resumed the office which he then filled, except he had the power to control their Lordships' voice upon the great constitutional question which had lately been agitated—a question involving not only the interests of the people, but, he would maintain, the very existence of the cherished liberties of this country. If that House was no longer to be graced and characterized by the independence which had been its pride and boast, it ceased from that hour to be a deliberative body. The noble Earl who had just sat down had explained the course which he proposed to take in the further progress of the Reform Bill. He would, in that respect, follow the noble Earl's example. The course, then, that he should take would be this: to the last moment that the Bill was under their Lordships' consideration, to offer all the opposition in his power to those parts of it to which he objected. To many of the provisions of the Bill he was prepared to assent. From first to last he had been ready to support Reform to a much greater extent than many of the noble Lords by whom he was surrounded; but differing, as he did, upon some points of the Bill, which, if carried into effect, he conscientiously believed would tend to the subversion of the Constitution, by destroying the just balance between the three powers of the State—differing from the noble Lords opposite, as he did, upon those points, he should, throughout the further progress of the Bill, by every means in his power, seek to amend them. By the same rule, upon those points in which he agreed with the noble Lords opposite, he would give them his honest support. But he felt that he was no longer a member of an independent body; he felt that, when he left the walls of that House, he should be an object of scorn; that the finger of scorn would be pointed at him as the member of a body which had lost its independence; as the member of a political body deprived of the power of legislation. He called God to witness, that since he had had the honour of a seat in that House, upon every great question he had never allowed party or factious feelings to bias his mind, but, as far as his judgment was correct, had endeavoured to promote that which he thought most conducive to the honour, happiness, and welfare of his country. It now seemed clear that the independence of that House was to be destroyed. It might be done in two ways; either by the withdrawing of noble Lords, as the noble Earl (Harewood) behind him proposed to do, by compulsion, or by the infusion of a great number of new Peers. In either way the independence of that House would be lost. It was vain to maintain that their Lordships' independence would not be destroyed by the creation of a number of Peers, which would make that House as close a borough as any of those decayed places which the noble Earl was going to destroy—which would make that House a packed Jury, to try questions of right and property deeply affecting the interests of the country. And when the delusion which had been kept up by a profligate and worthless Press had passed by, the people would see how far their interests and welfare had been compromised in the destruction of the independence of one of the branches of the Legislature. Before he sat down, he wished, in his character as an English citizen, proud still of his connexion with a country whose proudest boast had been the honest, open, ingenuous conduct which had placed it far above the level of any other nation upon earth, to call the noble Earl's attention to a subject which he conceived deeply concerned that noble Earl as the head of his Majesty's Government. In that capacity, he conceived that the noble Earl was bound to stand forward to uphold the character of his Sovereign from the base, malignant, false, and treasonable aspersions which had been cast upon him, within the last few days, by some of the leading journals of the metropolis. In the situation of difficulty in which the noble Earl had been placed during the preceding portion of the week, it was probable, that the aspersions to which he (Lord Winchilsea) alluded had escaped the noble Earl's observation. It was probable that the noble Earl had not had time to read the daily newspapers; but, now that the question of his remaining in office was settled—now that the noble Earl again appeared as the head of his Majesty's Government, he (Lord Winchilsea) called upon him, as an English citizen, to cast his eyes over those malignant, those false, those unjustifiable attacks, which had been levelled against our gracious Queen, who, by the virtues which adorned her character, had justly entitled herself to the esteem of every friend of virtue. He called upon the noble Earl to enforce the laws against the authors of those libels; and he begged to remind the noble Earl, that, having so called his attention to this subject, if he shrunk from the sacred duty which he owed to his Sovereign and to his country, he would, to a great degree, take the odium of those false and infamous attacks upon himself. The wrong was inflicted against one who deeply felt it, for a virtuous mind could feel the blasts of calumny, while one less sensitive, perhaps, might pass them by.

"Good name, in man or woman, dear my Lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls.
Who steals my purse, steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine; 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name,
Robs me of that, which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed."

The only ground of offence in that illustrious person had been, that she had shown herself the friend of virtue and morality. He felt convinced that no individual in the country had taken so little part—nay, who had kept so completely aloof from taking any part—upon the great question which now agitated the public mind, as her Majesty had done. But the point of offence was, that she had refused to receive females of profligate character, and have about her persons of doubtful reputation. That was the sole cause of the attacks which had been made upon that illustrious individual. In addition to these observations, he had only to remark, that in the course which he had expressed his determination to pursue he was influenced by no party motive—he had had no consultation, no communication, direct or indirect, with any person, either within or without the walls of that House.

The *Lord Chancellor:* In consequence of the expressions of the noble Earl who has just sat down, which I am sure were dictated by the warmth of his feelings at the instant, I am tempted to trespass for a very few moments on your Lordships' time. Nothing can be more natural than for the noble Earl to make those remarks without considering the assembly to which he offers them, and the peculiar functions of your Lordships in respect of the subject matter of which he complains. He—as well as the noble Lord last night—called upon the Government which then was, or shortly would be, to institute prosecutions for certain libels, or supposed libels. I cautiously use the words supposed libels, and that because I, as well as the rest of your Lordships—but I, perhaps, more particularly, by the situation which I have the honour to hold in this House—may, in the event of that advice being complied with, have to sit in judgment, as Judges—criminal Judges—on the very question of whether these publications are libels or not? That, I apprehend, is sufficient at once to remind the noble Earl of the next consideration which I shall submit to him, and to your Lordships, that if there be any one place where, more than any other place, such appeals and calls for prosecutions are peculiarly inappropriate, it is the House in which I have the honour now to stand; because it is the Judges who, in the last resort, are to decide on the questions raised by such prosecutions, that are called upon to consider whether or not those prosecutions shall be instituted. I consider it as grossly contrary to the functions which your Lordships exercise as Judges, that the question shall here previously be mooted, whether any such offences as those of which the noble Earl has complained shall be made the subject of prosecutions or not? I may have taken a wrong view of my duty here, but that is the principle upon which, since I have had the honour to sit here, I have uniformly acted, and, until I am convinced I am wrong, I shall continue so to do. The noble Earl, no doubt, forgot the situation in which he was speaking at the moment that the expressions fell from him, and, therefore, I could not help trespassing thus much upon your Lordships' time, to remind him of his judicial character, and, consequently, of the inappropriateness of his remarks.

The Earl of *Winchilsea:* I cordially concur in the sentiment expressed by the noble and learned Lord that on any question likely to come before your Lordships in a judicial character, it would be improper that any prejudice should be excited by previous discussion. I hope that I should be the last to wish to pursue any course likely to create such a prejudice. But if I have read, and know what treason is, I say that this is a question that can never come before this House. If ever an individual was guilty of treason, and that of the basest character—of a character that ought to be punished by the strongest infliction of the law—I say it is the being who has put forth the publication to which I have alluded. It is a question which can never come before your Lordships.

The *Lord Chancellor:* The noble Earl seems to have misunderstood me, and, therefore, I must beg to be permitted to say a word in explanation. Even if there were prosecutions instituted for high treason—not for seditious libels, which the publication which the noble Earl complains of can only be—because a publication cannot be treason, but only evidence of treason—but even supposing that prosecutions for high treason were to be instituted, those very prosecutions might still come before your Lordships by writ of error upon which your Lordships, as Judges in the last resort, would have to decide. What the noble Earl alludes to are seditious libels. I take it for granted that he means libellous publications. Now, it does happen that the question of libel, or not libel, may be so placed upon the record as to be brought before your Lordships in the last resort, when your Lordships would have to adjudicate the very question of whether the publication on which the party had been found guilty amounted to a libel or not. It is for a Jury in the first instance to say guilty or not guilty upon the fact of the publication, as well as upon the libellous tendency of the writing; but your Lordships may be called upon in the last resort to say whether the record be one upon which judgment can proceed, or not.

The Duke of *Newcastle* had anticipated the announcement which had been made by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government, from the altered demeanour of the persons who had assembled about the doors of the House. The tone of insult adopted by those persons towards the opponents of the Reform Bill seemed to have ceased. He was, therefore, prepared to hear of the noble Earl's reinstatement. As an individual, however, he (the Duke of Newcastle) did not feel more assured of his safety than he did before; and as he had suffered so much, both in person and property, he thought he had a pretty good right to appeal to their Lordships, and to ask whether the same system by which he had been injured was to be allowed to prevail throughout the whole country? In the circumstances in which they were then placed, it became necessary to come to some determination upon the matter which had been brought before the House. According to his idea, they were involving themselves in matters which were highly dangerous. He had observed that, from the beginning to the end of the discussions upon the Reform Bill, the King's name had been used to over-rule the decisions of that House. He must declare that such a use of the King's name was not to be tolerated, and he was surprised that the Ministers who sat in that House had tolerated it. Besides that, from first to last, it had been held out, that if this House would not give its assent to the provisions of the Bill, its independent voice should be overborne by the creation of a vast number of new Peers. Such a threat could not fail of being eminently repugnant to the feelings of every man who flattered himself that he belonged to a free and independent body of legislators. To bring the matter to a point, he (the Duke of Newcastle) proposed to make some motion upon the subject; and, if their Lordships would engage to support him, unfitted as he was for such an undertaking, he was still willing to impose it upon himself. If their Lordships would tolerate such a degree of thraldom as that which it was now proposed to subject them to, he must say they were not worthy of a seat in that House. If they would come forward as men and Englishmen to do their duty, for he (the Duke of Newcastle) said, that the King had no right to create Peers, and he called upon their Lordships to take steps to prevent such an act, which, if it were not prevented, would make them cease to be free and independent men; he called upon them, he said, to do their duty, and they might depend upon it, if they did so, the country would support them in it. He was convinced that there was not an honest man in the country who would not say that their Lordships were void of the spirit which ought to exist in the breast of every Englishman, and of English Peers particularly, if they did not exert themselves to prevent the execrable tyranny of allowing the King's Minister, on any occasion that he might think proper, to fetter the freedom of debate in their Lordships' House by the infusion of a fresh body of Peers. With their Lordships' permission, he should certainly take an opportunity of making a motion upon the subject.

Lord *Wharncliffe* certainly could not concur with the noble Duke who had just sat down in thinking that the King had not the power to make Peers for this or any other purpose. He apprehended that the King's prerogative upon that point was clear and indisputable. The only question was, whether the King's advisers were justified in the manner in which they would recommend him to exercise it. The noble Earl (Harewood) behind him had stated to the House the course that he intended to pursue. Before he (Lord Wharncliffe) decided upon a course, and before, as it appeared to him, any noble Peer could decide upon a course, it was necessary that he should have some further explanation from the noble Earl opposite, as to the situation in which that House was to be placed. Was he to understand that they were to have an increase of the House, or were their numbers to remain the same? Were their deliberations on the subject of Reform to be carried on under the threat and under the immediate pressure of a creation of Peers to carry the Bill? or upon what other ground did the noble Earl opposite found the expression that he made use of, viz. the confident expectation which he now had of carrying the Bill, unimpaired in principle and uninjured in all its essential provisions? Did the noble Earl found that confident expectation upon the belief that a certain number of Peers would absent themselves from the House, so as to enable him to carry the measure in any shape or form that he might think proper? Did the noble Earl found his expectation upon this, or did he intend to convert his expectation into reality by the creation of a sufficient number of Peers? He (Lord Wharncliffe) put these questions directly to the noble Earl, because he wished to know in what situation the House of Peers was to be placed. He should, therefore, return for a moment to his seat until the noble Earl had replied. He did not ask the question in a spirit of discourtesy; but as a Peer of Parliament, and, until that moment, an independent Member of it, he begged to learn of the noble Lord the precise situation in which he was then placed.

The Earl of *Radnor* said, that it was perfectly justifiable and proper in the noble Baron to ask for an explanation of anything that was stated in the House, but at the same time, he protested against that mode of questioning a Minister of the Crown, and a Privy Councillor, as to what he had or had not power to do. He did not understand on what ground it could be expected that a Minister should answer such questions, when in answering he might perhaps betray the counsels of his Sovereign, which he was bound to keep secret. They had heard last night explanations given of what passed between his Majesty and his Privy Councillors, without any intimation that his Majesty's permission to give such explanations had been asked for and obtained. He had heard it stated as a matter of doubt, whether Privy Councillors were justified in exposing what had passed confidentially between themselves and his Majesty, even when they had his Majesty's permission to explain, since they were bound by oath to keep his Majesty's counsel. But certainly he had never heard that they were at liberty to explain without having obtained his Majesty's permission. But what did the noble Baron call upon the noble Earl at the head of the Administration to say? And what was the reason assigned by the noble Baron for putting the question? Only to know on what footing he himself and the House stood? Why, the noble Baron stood exactly on the same footing as they all stood, and it was for him to exercise his own discretion and judgment as to what he should do, without having his opinions varied, or altered, or influenced by the consideration of whether new Peers were to be created, or any thing else was to be done. There was no ground whatever for putting the question. The noble Baron, and those who thought with him, would act as they pleased. Some of them said that they acted by compulsion. He really did not know what that compulsion was, or how their independence had been in the least infringed. They said, that their independence would be infringed by the creation of Peers. By the letter, as well as by the spirit of the Constitution, the King had the right to create Peers whenever he, acting on the responsibility of his Ministers, thought that the interests of the country required it, and, if so, he would ask whether this House had not always acted under the same compulsion as it had acted under during the last twenty days? If the creation of Peers was a breach of the law and the Constitution, it was a breach that had existed for a very long period. Where was the difference, in point of principle, between creating seventy Peers for a particular purpose, and creating one at one time and another at another, with a view of supporting a particular interest? The Crown had equally the power to create Peers in one way as the other, and the Ministers were bound to advise his Majesty to create Peers, if they thought that the interests of the country required that this should be done. They acted on their responsibility, and if they did any thing wrong or improper, they were liable to be impeached in that House, where their Lordships would sit as judges.

The Earl of *Carnarvon*: That was, they were to be judged by their own nominees.

The Earl of *Radnor* did not know what the noble Earl meant by nominees, or what right he had to call any noble Lords in that House, or that might be introduced into that House, nominees of the present Ministers, any more than nominees of any other Ministers. The noble Earl had, on one occasion, talked of noble Lords being driven by Ministers, as slaves by the whip of the driver; and now their Lordships were called nominees. Why, then, when the noble Earl's father was created a Peer for some purpose, what was he but a ministerial nominee? no matter whether one was created, or whether two, or twenty-two were created, the principle was the same. Suppose that some great public measure should be obstructed by the obstinacy of one Peer, and that the obstacle was removed by the creation of two Peers, the principle was the same as if the Crown had created twenty Peers; but the noble Lords opposite sometimes abandoned the ground of principle, and talked of swamping that House: he did not know what they meant by "swamping:" how could it be called "swamping" the House, when the Crown only exercised its undoubted and ordinary prerogative? But the real truth was, he was afraid, that the principle their Lordships acted upon was not the interests of the country, but the preservation of themselves as an exclusive order. Their consideration was not the welfare of the people: their object was not, by preventing the creation of Peers, to preserve their own independence—for, after the creation of new Peers, they would be as independent as before—but they wished to prevent the creation of new Peers to preserve their own order as exclusive and unchecked. The Ministers, however, were bound not to act on that principle; on the contrary, it was their duty to advise the Crown to create new Peers, provided they thought the interests of the country required it. It was a regard to the interests of their own exclusive order that made noble Lords stand between the Crown and the country upon the great measure now depending in Parliament. He thought that the great mass of the nation was right in the opinions which they had formed on that great measure, and that the confusion and obstruction of business which had prevailed such a long time was entirely owing to the noble Lords who had opposed its progress. It was the duty of Ministers to create new Peers if the measure could not be carried otherwise, and he hoped and trusted that Ministers would do their duty, and he had no doubt but that the best consequences would follow.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, as the noble Earl who had just sat down had interfered between the noble Earl opposite (Earl Grey) and himself, he wished to know whether he was to take the speech of that noble Earl (Radnor) as an answer to the questions he had felt it his duty to put?

Earl *Grey* did not feel himself called upon to answer the questions which had been put to him by the noble Baron: he had already stated, that he continued to hold office under the confident expectation that the Bill would be carried successfully through its future stages in that House. The noble Baron had no right to put any further questions, and he would be bound only by what he himself had stated.

Lord *Wharncliffe* was quite aware that the noble Earl was not accountable for what others might say; but with reference to the other noble Earl (the Earl of Radnor) he must say, that of all the speeches he had ever heard, his was the most extraordinary. He had long known the noble Earl in his political life, and had long admired his ingenuity and tact in debate; but on this occasion, if he had been asked to point out any one more unlikely than another to have made such a speech, he should have named the noble Earl. That noble Earl had always acted a most independent part, and he was quite sure that he would not come to that House to hear the mockery of free debate if a creation of Peers should take place. That noble Earl had said, that he (Lord Wharncliffe), and other noble Lords on that side of the House, did not oppose the measure for the sake of the well-being of the country, but because they wished to preserve all the advantages of their exclusive order. Now, he would ask, was there then no use in the House of Lords? Was it for their own exclusive sakes they sat in deliberation in that House? Or was it not by the grace of their Sovereign they were placed there, to have a free voice in all the national deliberations? If that House was not formed for the sake of the country—if it had not been framed with a view to deliberate for the good of the country—then he would say, that the House of Lords was useless, that it was at an end—and that the sooner the House of Commons took upon themselves the functions of their Lordships' House also, the better. Could any man doubt, when he talked of revolution, that it had virtually taken place within the last few days? This was a question affecting all parties of the State, affecting every one of their Lordships in their individual capacity, and the House of Lords in its collective capacity. What was the fact? After agreeing to the second reading of the Reform Bill upon going into Committee, and upon an Amendment being carried in that Committee, the Ministers had tendered advice to the Sovereign, requesting him to create Peers, with a view to overpower the votes of their Lordships on that side of the House. The Sovereign had refused that advice. The Ministry, in consequence of this refusal, found themselves placed in a harassing situation. But he would ask any man, whether this precise Bill must not be said to be carried by the House of Commons in its present state, against the opinion of the House of Lords, and, as he might infer from what had passed, against the opinion of the Crown? Let not noble Lords deceive themselves. The power of the State was now in the House of Commons, and their Lordships must see that, if they did not pass the Bill of the House of Commons, their votes were to be overpowered by a creation of Peers. He would say, that the House of Lords was no longer free, and that it remained to be seen how long the monarchy itself would exist. In spite of all the falsehoods and calumnies which had gone forth, he maintained that, neither on his own part, nor on the part of any noble Lord near him, had there been any attempt made, or any desire shown to get rid of the Bill. They might have been mistaken in the course which they had pursued on a late occasion. He freely confessed he considered it a great mistake in those who were willing to proceed to the consideration of the Reform Bill. Noble Peers, however, were now placed in a different position from that in which they stood on the second reading; and the principle of Reform having been entertained, it was surely in their power to amend the Bill, reserving to themselves the right to vote against the details of the measure in Committee: then why, he would ask, had not an opportunity been afforded to those noble Lords who did not mean to oppose any of the essential points of the Bill, to propose their amendments? But no, said the noble Earl, you have said, let us have the disfranchisement clause postponed till we have considered the enfranchisement clause. Now, he thought, and confessed it, that the noble Earl's view of the case was, in some respects, right, and he had always felt, that the motion made on a previous evening was one which was likely to put both sides of the House in a difficult position, and he had resisted the bringing forward that motion as far as he could in deference to those with whom he was bound to act. The question, however, having been introduced, the noble Earl opposite maintained that it touched the principles of the Bill, and, therefore, he went to his Majesty, advising him to make a sufficient number of Peers to enable the noble Earl to effect the passing of the Bill. He must deny, however, that this motion touched the principle of the Bill, and in so saying he spoke not only his own opinion, but that of many other Lords; and he trusted noble Lords opposite him would excuse him when he declared, that they themselves had afforded him the strongest arguments which could be given in favour of the course which had been pursued. Had it been sought, in the first place, to reduce the disfranchising clause materially, the noble Earl would, in such a case, have had a right to complain: but not so when the proposition made was merely that the first clause be deferred. He would not repeat what had already been said by noble Lords behind him as to the question having been treated in a different manner in the other House of Parliament, and he would admit that this was not the time to argue the merits of the measure generally, or in detail; but as they were now threatened with something, in consequence of the votes which they had given on the occasion to which he had referred, he was anxious to know what crime they had committed in so doing; and, until he did know this, the noble Earl must pardon him when he said, that the agitation of the country for the last four days was the work of the noble Earl, and was caused wantonly and unnecessarily. As, however, the noble Earl did not seem to wish to give an answer to the question which had been put, he would presume to say something else, and would observe that, for his own part, he could not come to any conclusion as to what might be his own conduct under existing circumstances. He must know, first, what was to be the real position in which the House was to be placed, before he took that line which he might think it his duty to pursue. He did not think that noble Lords opposite had a right to call upon them to declare what their conduct would be on that side of the House, when the noble Earl had merely declared his "confident expectation that the Bill would be completely successful in its future stages." Begging pardon of their Lordships for his having run the risk of tiring them, he would only then add, that at any time when the noble Earl might think fit, he should be glad to receive some further information from him, but, in the meantime, he must declare, that he could not give any pledge as to his future conduct while he remained in ignorance of what might be the course intended to be pursued by the noble Earl.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, he rose to make what was, perhaps, a vain effort, to obtain some information from the noble Earl as to what was to be the situation in which the House was to be placed on Monday next. In doing so he did not mean to ask him to render any information which could be considered as inconsistent with his duty, or with his oath as a Privy Councillor. He wished to know and he considered he had a right to put the question—whether it was the intention of the noble Earl, after the declaration which had been made by the noble Duke (a declaration which he would say noble Lords opposite had not treated in the most courteous manner), in going into Committee, to preclude noble Lords from the exercise of that privilege which had never been refused till then, namely, the privilege of endeavouring to correct the details of that measure, without invading the essential parts of the Bill, with a view to make it more palatable to all classes of his Majesty's subjects? Conciliation, he and the rest of the noble Lords on that side of the House had tendered? [*hear*]. Noble Lords opposite cheered. He knew that by the word "conciliation" was conveyed, in their interpretation of the word, passive obedience. The noble Earl had once professed the real Whig principles, but the principles which the noble Earl had since substituted for them were such as he never could adopt. The time had been when, if the noble Earl had used towards that House such language as he had lately applied to them, he would have been called indignantly to order, for no real Whig Peers would have endured it. The time had been when it would have been impossible to have believed that, upon a question in a Committee of that House, such a course would have been pursued as that of the noble Earl. But here he touched upon an unfortunate subject. The Minister of the Crown to whom he alluded, still existed to witness the destruction of that Constitution of which he had formerly been one of the greatest champions. If, indeed, instead of the unheeded voice which then addressed their Lordships, the voice of a Grenville could have been raised in that House, the noble Earl would have stood rebuked and ashamed. But the question which he was desirous of putting to the noble Earl was, whether it was the noble Earl's intention to permit the House to go through the Committee temperately and calmly? For he could assure the noble Earl that, as far as he himself, and the other noble Lords who sat on the same side of the House, were concerned, all he and they wished for was, that the amendments which they had to propose might be properly discussed, and adopted, if they were thought to be improvements in the Bill. He wished to know whether it was intended to propose to his Majesty to agree to such a creation of Peers as should deprive the House of Lords of the power of coming to any independent conclusion; or whether, the noble Earl having ascertained what were the intentions of noble Lords, such proceeding would be waived? And he begged to assure the noble Earl, that while the Peers were the last men to submit to dictation, they were equally ready, on the other hand, to make every proper concession that might lead to conciliation. He begged to say, that the intention of the noble Lords on his side of the House was, not to destroy the Bill, but to endeavour to make such amendments as the noble Lords opposite might with honour accept, and such as every Reformer should not be dissatisfied with. He wished no further pledge from the noble Earl as to what he might think it proper to do; but he was desirous that, if the Committee were to pass the Bill, it should go out of that House in a manner which was fit to make it the law of the land. In short, he wished distinctly to know, whether or not the House would be permitted to proceed with the Bill uninterfered with by the exercise of the authority of the Crown in the manner which had been suggested. Having given a pledge on the part not only of himself, but also on the part, of every noble Lord on that side of the House, that the deliberations on the measure should be conducted in a spirit of conciliation and calmness, he would only add, that, should the noble Earl not condescend to give him an answer, their Lordships would, perhaps, allow him to say a few words more.

Earl *Grey*, in rising, said, he was quite sure that the whole House must be perfectly persuaded, that nothing could be so mild, so conciliatory, or so calm as the conduct which the noble Earl had evinced throughout the discussions on this question; conduct which the noble Earl would lead the House to suppose that he (Earl Grey) had throughout avoided. He did not mean, however, either to imitate the noble Earl's conduct or the tone of his speech on this occasion. With reference to the question of the noble Earl, as to whether it was his (Earl Grey's) intention to allow the House to proceed temperately and calmly in Committee, he thought he might with more propriety put that question to the noble Earl opposite, because he felt satisfied that the matter depended chiefly on the spirit with which the noble Earl opposite and his friends went into that Committee. He was not aware of any occasion upon which he had departed from that conduct which was due to the House. "With respect to the other question," said the noble Earl, "it is one which the noble Earl opposite has no right to put, and which I certainly will not answer."

The Earl of *Carnarvon* again rose, and said, that the refusal of the noble Earl to answer might arise from contempt towards him; if so, he was at a loss to determine whether he should esteem it as a compliment, or otherwise. In allusion to what had fallen from the noble Earl, he challenged the noble Earl to state, that one intemperate word had passed his lips during a six weeks' discussion on this subject. His questions remained unanswered, for when the noble Earl said, that whether their Lordships should proceed with temper to the consideration of the Bill in Committee or not, depended upon him (the Earl of Carnarvon), that was no answer to the question which had been put to the noble Earl. The question which had been put was, whether their Lordships would be permitted to proceed with the Bill, without the interference of the noble Earl, and without the exercise of the royal authority, by which the exertions of their Lordships to improve the measure would be rendered abortive, and whether that threat was to be carried into effect after their Lordships' labours in Committee were completed. Temper and conciliation had been offered to the noble Earl, but he, in form calm, though not in substance, never had held out a hand in return—nay, he would not submit to the least alteration in the measure, not even to the amount of a vulgar fraction. Warm, certainly, he should be, and loud also, while he could raise his voice against this attempt made to destroy their Lordships' authority, and forcibly to put down the independence of Parliament. He entreated the noble Earl, for the sake of himself, and for the sake of their Lordships, to answer the question which he had put, for he, (the Earl of Carnarvon) for one would never sit in that House in such a kind of mock debate, or to bandy arguments with the fifty or sixty liveried lacquies of the noble Earl. The language he was now expressing was the expiring language of British honour in this country, He was told by the noble Earl, that he should consider in a calm, and, what the noble Earl would designate a conciliatory manner, that which he must contemplate as the future degradation of that House. Now he should hold himself unworthy of a seat in that House if he did not express the warm and indignant feelings which he entertained in considering such a subject as this. The noble Earl opposite might talk of those gentlemen which he intended to introduce into that House. Gentlemen! Perhaps he was not justified as yet in giving them that name. Probably the bellman had not as yet gone round to summon to the peerage the first fifty or sixty persons of the age of twenty-one and upwards, who would condescend to accept of such a dubious honour; their patents, at all events, would be different from the patents of all former Peers. His father had received his patent for no unworthy act; he received it on account of his conduct in resisting mob dictation in the time of Lord George Gordon's riots. He was quite sure that his father would never have received a patent on such grounds at the present period. The peerage had not been conferred on his father on a pledge from him that he would assist in drowning the independent voice of that House. The noble Earl alluded to the possibility of a collision between the two Houses of Parliament. Now no collision existed between the two Houses at present, and he was certain, that if that House were left to its own will, no collision between the two Houses would be produced by the Amendments which that House might make in the Bill. He held his seat in that House on account of no act of oppression towards that House, nor on account of any act that tended to its degradation and destruction. It was to him a matter of indifference whether that House died by an act of suicide or by one of the foulest assassination. But he had one request to make of the noble Earl, the last that he should ever prefer to him, and it was this—that the noble Earl, before he did that which would effectually swamp that House, would bring in a bill—and he made this an earnest request, to deprive him (the Earl of Carnarvon) of the degradation of belonging to such a House, or of sitting in company with those who would permit themselves to be made Peers to serve the temporary purposes of that noble Earl. He further wished that the noble Earl would introduce a clause into that bill to restore him to those privileges which he believed he had never done any thing to forfeit—the privileges of an English commoner—privileges of which he should be always proud, and which, together with the privileges of a British Statesman, he trusted he should, even after the passing of this measure, be allowed to exercise. He hoped the noble Earl would grant a request which he now preferred to him in perfect seriousness. He meant to petition the noble Earl and the House to that effect. He was sure that it would not be long before the people of this country would be roused from that state of intoxication into which they had been plunged by certain persons, for reasons of their own, and before they would learn to distinguish their real friends from their treacherous oppressors.

The Bishop of *Bristol* wished to offer a very few observations to their Lordships on this occasion. He considered that it would be a most unconstitutional exercise of the royal prerogative to create a number of Peers in order to swamp the independence of that House. He trusted that the noble Lords on the other side of the House would not withdraw from it during the discussions in the Committee on the Bill, but that they would attend and do their duty, by endeavouring to amend the Bill, if they could; and if they should thus succeed in bringing it to such a shape that it would be more serviceable and more palatable to the country, they would effect great good. From the representations which he had that day received from Bristol and the neighbouring country he could state, that a large portion of the people there were inimical to the extent of the present Bill.

Motion for going into Committee on Monday next, agreed to.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Friday, May 18, 1832.

Minutes.] Papers ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Lamb, of the Reduction and Augmentation of the Duties on Coals, Sugar, Wine, and Spirits; and of the Reductions of the Establishment and Charges of Management consequent on the Repeal of the Duties on Coal and Slate; and of the several Amounts paid from the Exchequer (Ireland), in the year 1831, for Half-pay and Superannuated Allowances.—On the Motion of Mr. Marshall, of the Scale of Duties on Bills of Exchange in England.

Bills. Read a second time:—Insolvent Debtors Acts Continuation (England.) Read a third time: — Insolvent Debtors (India.)

Petitions presented. By Mr. Benett, from the Political Union, Bradford; from Melksham, Devizes, and Coggeshall;—by Mr. Hodges, from Deptford, and six other places in Kent;—by Mr. Gore Langton, from Shepton Mallet, and St. James's, Bath;—by Mr. Robinson, from Worcester;—by Mr. Thicknesse, from Wigan;—by Sir Charles Burrell, from Lewes;—and by an Hon. Member, from Tewkesbury,—for stopping the Supplies till the Reform Bill be passed.—By Mr. Townley, from Royston and Wisbeach, for the Abolition of Slavery.

Ministerial Arrangements.] Mr. *Hume* begged to put a question to the noble Lord opposite, before he determined what he should do on the subject of the Call for Monday. He begged to ask, whether such an arrangement had taken place as was likely to satisfy that House, that matters were in progress by which the carrying of the Reform Bill would be secured?

Lord *Althorp:* I am happy, Sir, to take the earliest opportunity of rising to state, in answer to the question of the hon. Member, what has been done. I beg to state to the House, that his Majesty's Ministers conceive they have secured for the passing of the Reform Bill such an arrangement as they deem sufficient, and, therefore, that we continue to hold the offices we are now in possession of.

Lord *Milton:* Under the circumstances stated by my noble friend, it is, perhaps, desirable, that I should state for the information of Gentlemen to whom my intentions have been communicated, that after the assurance which my noble friend has just made, it is no longer my intention to submit to this House that Address which I had previously proposed to offer for their adoption.

Mr. *Hume:* And I beg, Sir, to move to discharge the Order for the Call of the House, which I had before fixed for Monday next.

Sir *Robert Peel:* I was not aware, Sir, of the intention of the noble Lord to submit any proposition to this House. If I had been, as a man deeply interested in the prosperity of the State, deeply interested, too, in seeing some termination of the present state of affairs consistent with the honour of all parties, I should have deprecated this untimely interference. Even if the noble Lord (Lord Althorp) had not made the announcement which he has now made, if it had been found impossible that the present Ministry should return to office, I should have risen for the purpose of entreating the noble Lord, not without notice—not without giving us an opportunity of maturing our opinions, most certainly not, while negotiations were still pending—to bring before this House any vote which could by possibility interpose fresh difficulties in the way of an arrangement. That is the course which, in the best exercise of my discretion, I should have recommended him to pursue. But all intervention on this subject on the part of the House of Commons is precluded by the communication which the noble Lord has just made. The House will, perhaps, permit me, although there is no one who is more averse to trouble them with explanations of a personal nature, yet, as the crisis is so important, and the part which I have taken has been so much discussed, the House will, perhaps, permit me to occupy their attention for a few moments, while I state the grounds on which the decision I came to was formed. I will make this explanation as briefly as possible, and what I am about to state shall be merely for my own vindication. On Wednesday last a communication was made to me by a noble friend, for whom, notwithstanding all the calumnies that have been directed against him, I avow that I entertain the sincerest esteem, I mean Lord Lyndhurst, yes, Sir, I will not shrink notwithstanding the difference of opinion which a majority of this House may express, from making an avowal of the high opinion I entertain of the talents and of the public character of that noble Lord. On Wednesday last Lord Lyndhurst waited on me, stating—not that he had authority from his Majesty to form an Administration, but that, having been his Majesty's Lord Chancellor—now holding a high judicial situation—and being, on that account, out of the immediate vortex of political affairs; he had been for these reasons, selected by his Majesty, for the purpose of conferring with him on the present state of affairs. The noble Lord inquired whether I considered it to be in my power to enter into the King's service at this crisis? He stated the difficulties in which his Majesty had been placed by the resignation of his late servants, on account of his refusal to create Peers for the purpose of carrying the Reform Bill. I was informed that the only other person who had been then consulted was the Duke of Wellington, who was determined to assist his Majesty in any way—who wished no office, but who was ready to take office, if his taking of office was considered likely to facilitate the formation of a Government. Although no communication was then made to me by the express command of his Majesty, yet, as I see no occasion to maintain any reserve when entering on an explanation of this kind, I will state that I did understand the question as formally put to me, whether I was willing to accept that office which in political life is supposed to be the highest object of ambition. I ought to state, in justice to the King, that it was at the same time notified to me, that the acceptance of office must be on the clear understanding that his Majesty's past declarations with regard to Reform be fulfilled, and that whoever took office must accept it on the condition of introducing an extensive measure of Reform. I replied to Lord Lyndhurst, I admit, upon the impulse of the moment, but upon an impulse which my maturer judgment only served to confirm, that no authority nor example of any man, or any number of men, could shake my resolution not to accept office under existing circumstances, upon such conditions. I answered under the influence of feelings which no reasoning could abate, that it would not be for my honour, or for the advantage of the country, that I should accept office, on the condition of introducing an extensive measure of Reform. In the present state of affairs, I considered, and I believe with perfect justice, that by extensive Reform was meant the adoption of the leading provisions of the Bill. I do not say all the provisions of the Bill, without exception, but all that are essential to carry into full effect its principles. I said to Lord Lyndhurst, that I must decide for myself on the instant, on a review of the peculiar situation in which I stood; that I felt the difficulties in which the King was placed; that I had never entertained so strong a wish to serve his Majesty as I now did, for the purpose of removing those difficulties; but that, if I were to accept office without an unreproaching conscience—if I were to enter this House for the purpose of discharging its duties without a light heart, a firm step, and an erect aspect, I could render no effectual service to his Majesty, or to the country. What is the situation in which I stand with respect to Reform—to that measure, the adoption of the principles of which was to be the condition of my appointment to office, I have given it the most strenuous opposition, continued to the latest moment. I deprecated the principle of the Bill, fraught as I believe it to be with injustice. I considered it a revolutionary measure, calculated to introduce such changes in the practical working of the Constitution, as, if not revolutionary in themselves, would lead to revolution; and, therefore, to the principles and details of that Bill I have offered to the last, my most decided opposition. Those with whom I have co-operated received a declaration from me very early, that I should take that course with respect to Reform and the Reform Bill, that must preclude me from taking office under circumstances like the present; and, having done that, where is he who thinks, that out of 658 Members of this House I could be the chosen man to stand in that place as Minister, in order to recommend the adoption of that Bill of which I had been the chief opponent? If it were necessary to select a person as a mediator between hostile parties, am I, who have been the head of one of those parties, proper to be selected for that purpose? Is it likely, in proposing modifications of the Bill, that I, of all men could have persuaded the majority to which I have been opposed, to acquiesce in my recommendation for the improvement of their Bill? I ground the vindication of the course I have taken (if vindication be necessary) on the peculiar position in which I personally stand. So far from calling in question the motives of others, who were inclined to take office in order to relieve the King from the difficulties with which he was surrounded, that I hold them in the utmost respect. I firmly believe, that those men who were willing, at such a crisis, to devote themselves to the service of the Crown, acted not only from the most disinterested motives, but from motives the highest and purest by which public men could be actuated. Their reasons for taking that course were, that they should have lowered themselves in their own esteem if they had not been ready to make that sacrifice; and it was precisely on the same ground, a sense of personal honour, on which I decided that I could not take office in order to carry the Reform Bill. That conviction was rooted too strongly in my mind, to make it possible that my service could be useful service. Some allowance, Sir, must be made for human failings. Other considerations were amply sufficient; but I could not cast out of my view the conduct I had been compelled to pursue with respect to the Catholic Bill. I then reviewed my former declarations, and took a course directly contrary to that I had before pursued. But, Sir, the difference between the two cases was great. I was then the responsible adviser of the Crown, and, looking at the state of the country, the state of public opinion, and at the general condition of Europe, I thought it my duty to submit to the King, on a review of the then existing circumstances, that there was an immediate and pressing evil which must be remedied without delay, and that the danger of further resistance to the claims of the Roman Catholics was, upon the whole, greater than the concession. I gave that advice to the Crown; but I say now, as I have said before, that I did all that it was possible to do to relieve myself from the necessity of proposing that measure, and to retire from office. But even if it were possible to repeat the conduct I then pursued, this is not a repetition of the Catholic Question; I have not advised the King to propose the Reform Bill; I am not a responsible Minister of the Crown; and being out of office, I felt myself perfectly justified in declining to enter it on a condition (perhaps an unavoidable condition) that my first act should be the proposal of Reform—I say the proposal of it —because it would have been a miserable evasion, to place some other person in the situation of proposer, with my consent to, and support of the proposal. It may be —indeed it has been said—that the English Bill of Reform had passed the House of Commons—and that, therefore, a Minister in the House of Commons would have had no further concern with it. This may be technically true, so far as discussion in the House is concerned—but what advice was that Minister to give to the King, with respect to the progress of the Bill in the Lords? Was he to advise that it should pass unmodified—or that it should pass subject to modification and change? In either case did he not virtually adopt the Bill, as much as if it still had remained under consideration in the House of Commons? But even if there be any force in this observation with respect to the English Bill of Reform, what is the case with respect to the Scotch, and to the Irish Bill? They have not passed the House of Commons—they are here undecided on; and the first consequence of my acceptance of office must have been the completion and perfection of two Bills, to one of which at least—namely, the Irish, I am decidedly opposed. I ask any man whther it be likely that I could, as Minister, bring either one or the other to a satisfactory termination. But I look further than to either of these Bills—I speak of the measure of Reform generally. Granted that the immediate settlement of that question is now become unavoidable—granted that there is as much danger, as circumstances now stand, in peremptory rejection, as there can be in any other course that can be taken; that the best result would be, the acceptance of the Bill with extensive modifications not incompatible with its main principles. Even in that case, could such modifications be proposed by me with any prospect of advantage? From the original authors of the measure modification might be accepted; and I do trust that they will now feel, that they can originate with honour all modifications which they may think reasonable and just. But modifications suggested by a decided opponent, would not be received by the country as a final settlement of the question. The parties who are now about, for the first time, to receive privileges from the provisions of this Bill, would consider themselves under no obligations for such privileges, if they were extorted from an enemy to the Bill, but would receive them with an increased desire to acquire in a second Bill that which had not been conceded in the first. These are the reasons that prompted me to take the course which I have pursued on this occasion. The impulse on which I acted, when first applied to, satisfied me at that time, and reason has since convinced me, that neither for my own honour, nor for public advantage, could I accept office, if the acceptance of office was to be under the condition of supporting the provisions of the Bill, either as it now exists in the House of Lords, or with such modifications only as were consistent with its main provisions. These opinions separated me from some noble friends of mine, who did not feel themselves placed in the same situation. I regret that separation, even though it be temporary, particularly the separation from that man whom I chiefly honour, and I am anxious to declare, that even that separation has only raised him in my esteem. One word more. It has been insinuated, in some of those channels through which the public generally obtain their information, that I have been influenced in the course which I have pursued, by the lurking suspicion that any Government now to be established could not be permanent, and that I was a party to the formation of a phantom Government which should carry the Reform Bill, in the belief that, when that was done, I could step in and build my authority and power upon the ruins of that Administration. If there is any Gentleman in this House who thinks my conduct open to the slightest suspicion in this respect, who thinks it in the least necessary for me to explain it, I will satisfy him that that was not the motive of the course which I pursued. The only opinion I expressed was (if a reconciliation between his Majesty and the members of his Majesty's Government should prove impracticable) in favour of an arrangement which was most likely to be permanent, and which, while it continued in operation, must necessarily exclude me from office. As, however, some person has stated, that on this subject he defies contradiction, and that I was a party to an understanding such as I have mentioned, I beg leave, in as distinct words as one man is capable of using in contradicting another, to declare that it is an infamous falsehood. I look at the circumstances in which the country is placed with much deeper interest than any I can have in my return to office, and I can with truth assert, that this is the last consideration to which I have adverted in any advice I have given in reference to recent events.

Lord *Althorp:* After the speech just made by the right hon. Gentleman, it is quite impossible for me to avoid saying a few words. Though it has been my fate to be opposed to him in politics, I have never had reason to suspect that he, in any part of his conduct, has departed from that line which an honourable man ought to pursue. Feeling this, I can not remain silent, after hearing the right hon. Gentleman allude to the insinuations made against his conduct, but I must declare, that the statement he has made has given me great satisfaction, and it proves that the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman has been on this, as on all former occasions, worthy of his high reputation.

Mr. *Baring* said, that no one had heard with greater satisfaction than he had, the communication made by the noble Lord opposite, not only on account of the welfare of the country, but on account of the particular situation in which he found himself. He had no intention of addressing more than a few observations to the House, and in them he should cautiously abstain from employing any topics, or referring to any circumstance which might occasion a debate on the events that had just taken place. But if he should sit entirely silent after the explanation of his right hon. friend, perhaps the House would think that in some respects he might be open to the imputation that the right hon. Gentleman's conduct might seem to throw upon those who had pursued a different line of conduct. He felt all the difficulties of the case which his right hon. friend had stated. He knew the motives stated were true, because most of them had been communicated to him. He was able, therefore, confidently to state what were the motives assigned at the time, and he was happy to be able to do so, since, though those motives were so easily understood, and were so obvious to any one who judged rightly, yet there were few who did judge in that manner, or who did not willingly receive imputations on the motives of public men. At the same time, speaking of the case of the right hon. Gentleman abstractedly, he must say, that he differed from the right hon. Gentleman as to the course he had pursued. He had ventured to press upon the right hon. Gentleman a different line of conduct. The view he had taken of the matter, and that which he had reason to suppose had been taken by the noble Duke who took the principal part in the affair, was, not that any Administration was to be formed to carry the Reform Bill, or to sanction or support it, so as to sacrifice the character of the persons composing that Administration—but the simple question was, the King being ready to consent that this Bill, in substance, should pass, to obviate those circumstances connected with the passing of this Bill to which he could not adhere, and to resist which he called for assistance. That was the position of things when Lord Lyndhurst was sent for, and when the Duke of Wellington undertook to see whether some arrangements could not be made. Suppose, that Gentlemen admitted the King to be right—suppose the King said, that the passing of this Bill was essential in the state of the country—was that a reason, because Ministers had the country at their back and could not be resisted, that they were to avail themselves of these circumstances to force the King's consent to other circumstances to which, as a Monarch, the King could not agree. Because his Majesty believed that Reform was essential and necessary to the peace and tranquillity of the country, and because he had declared that opinion, should he be accused of changing his opinion, merely for not having consented to yield to other circumstances of a dissimilar nature? He (Mr. Baring) did not wish to argue that view of the question, but that being the view he took of it, then came the question, whether any man in the noble Duke's situation was to say, "No, I have taken such a line of conduct, that whatever difficulties you may labour under, whatever contumely may be heaped upon you, whatever may be your condition, I can offer you no assistance." That was the strict, and, as he considered it, the honest way of viewing the subject. No Gentleman who had read a line or passed through his mind a thought on the Constitution of the country, would say that that was not the proper view of the case. When he saw the Duke of Wellington, his Grace stated, that he should be ashamed to crawl—that was the word his Grace used—that he should be ashamed to crawl about the metropolis if he did not go to the assistance of the King. He did not wish to go further into explanation, but he must say, that, so far from what some miserable minds that were themselves actuated by the motives which they imputed to others, being true, the arrangement proposed would have excluded the noble Duke from power, and probably from office. He must say, that great as was his admiration of that great man, he had never seen any thing that was a proof of greater magnanimity than the resolution which he then came to. By his conduct he had exposed himself to the abuse and scurrility of the lower orders, and particularly of the Press; but among all who troubled themselves to understand, no one would hesitate to say, that though he might have acted more prudently and cautiously, he could not have exhibited a greater act of heroism. The object of the King was, if possible, to reform the Commons without destroying the Peers, although Gentlemen on the other side of the House might possibly think, that to have added to the number of Lords would have greatly improved them. If the Duke of Wellington had failed to answer the call of his Majesty, the necessary consequence must have been, that he would have been thrown back upon his former Ministers. What then would have been the King's situation? He would have been placed in the grasp of an Administration which compelled him to do acts to which he was entirely adverse. The King could have no will of his own. The House would recollect, that when insanity unfortunately attacked George 3rd, the utmost care was taken to ascertain whether his Majesty could exercise any degree of volition, before a Regency was appointed; but with respect to William 4th there would not be an absence of volition, but a presence of an adverse volition. He put it to any man, whether such would be a proper situation in which to place the King of this country according to its Constitution. The Duke of Wellington saw his Majesty's extremity, and finding, too, that nobody would go to assist him, he stepped forward and did his duty. To say the least of it his conduct had been highly meritorious.

Sir *Richard Vyvyan* said, he had always understood that the King of England was not responsible, but that his Ministers were. He must protest against the doctrine that had been broached, insinuating responsibility in the Monarch. If the great and fundamental principle that the King can do no wrong, were to be abolished, he believed it would be most dangerous for the country. In all previous changes of Administration a new policy had been the result of the change. The King, in changing his Administration, might have personal opinions with regard to the basis on which the new Government should be formed; and as the choice of Ministers was in the breast of the Crown, those opinions might form the basis of any future system of Government, provided the Minister who accepted the responsible situation, chose to be answerable for the consequences that might be the result of adopting such a line, and thus, the mere acceptance of office was in itself an act for which a Minister would have to answer to Parliament, if the acceptance was connected with any great measure of State policy. He did not mean to deny that the King had a right to choose his own Minister, or to submit to that Minister the line which he expected him to adopt; but he maintained, that the King of England in so doing, acted upon his own free will—that he could be pledged or bound to no one upon the subject—that he was as perfectly at liberty to change the whole plan of State management, as the new Minister was at liberty to accept or refuse being a party to any arrangement as a basis upon which the Government should be conducted. To apply this doctrine to present circumstances: his Majesty's present Ministers had resigned, in consequence of a refusal of the King to exercise the prerogative of the Crown to an extent never before heard of; and the Duke of Wellington was called upon to form a new Administration, it being understood that the basis upon which such a Government was to be formed should be the Reform Bill of Earl Grey, or something like it. To propose this basis to the new Minister, or to the person whom his Majesty wished to be his Minister, was within the competency of the King; but that proposition could only be the result of his own free will. The Duke of Wellington, who had strenuously opposed Reform, had but one alternative, since his Majesty had expressed so decided an opinion about the Bill; he was either to undertake to pass the Bill, or a measure in all its leading features like it, or else he was to retire with the certainty that the Bill would be passed, and that a large creation of Peers would be made. The choice, therefore, of rejecting the Bill was not in the power of his Grace, that was not the alternative; for whether he refused or accepted the King's commission, it was predetermined that the Bill should pass; but he had to decide whether the independence of the House of Lords should be annihilated, or he would consent to be a party to the proposed arrangement. He had stated the case in as fair a manner as he could, and he hoped to the satisfaction of those most disposed to find fault with the Duke of Wellington's consistency. His Grace adopted the noble course of not deserting the country in the hour of need; and he used every effort to save the House of Lords, finding that he was compelled to concur in passing the Bill. Posterity would judge whether his Grace was right or wrong in offering to make a sacrifice of himself and of his personal opinions, with the view of preventing what was obviously a double evil. He declared that he disapproved of the Reform of the House of Commons; but being under no circumstances able to prevent that Reform, he would have accepted office to save the independence of the other branch of the Legislature. He fully appreciated the motives that had induced his right hon. friend, the member for Tamworth, to decline being a party to such a proceeding; the situation in which he stood with regard to the Reform of Parliament was different from that of the Duke of Wellington—he had made more decided and solemn protestations on the subject of the Reform Bill—he had declared that no circumstances should ever induce him to bring such a Bill into the House of Commons, and considering his position in the House—it being certain that he must be the leader of the Ministerial party—he never could consent to what might be looked upon as a shuffling manœuvre, to deputing another person, either in or out of the Cabinet, to bring the Bill before the House. It was a solemn pledge repeated more than once; and not only for the consistency of his right hon. friend, but for the advantage that the public might derive hereafter from his services, he deemed it right to decline being a member of the new Administration, although he professed himself willing to give every support that he could to such a Government. Unlike the Duke of Wellington, he had not a high military reputation to fall back upon; he would have been exposed to the hatred of one party, who would look on him as the cause of their loss of office, to the envy of another, and to the misunderstanding of those who would not be able to take a correct view of the difficult position in which he had been placed. Under these circumstances his right hon. friend might have been useless to the cause he wished to serve; and, much as he lamented the decision to which his right hon. friend had come, he was fully justified in the course he had adopted. The King of England, as he had before stated, could do no wrong: his Ministers were alone responsible. The King was bound by no Letter written by that Minister or this Secretary. Ministers had attempted that which he (Sir Richard Vyvyan) had no hesitation in saying was an act of treason—for having attempted that which, in another reign, formed a subject of impeachment. The act of Ministers in that reign to which he had made allusion, was of a minor description, compared with the attempt of the present Ministers. The latter had, with one blow, recommended the overpowering of one of the branches of the Legislature, merely because a particular clause in a Bill had been postponed, contrary to the wishes of the Administration. He was quite certain that when these extraordinary transactions were fully developed and calmly reasoned upon, the conduct of the King to preserve the House of Peers would be highly esteemed. He had no apprehensions as to the results of a general election, had such a course been recommended, and he believed, that if an election had taken place, and the question raised in the country as to the determination of the King not to create Peers, his name would have been found as potent as it was last year.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, that the machinery of the Administration had disclosed some latent movements which were before unknown. Upon these the country would now have an opportunity of forming a judgment. He could not but complain of the speeches made in that House by the hon. members for Middlesex, Kerry, Calne, and Northumberland. Had the House forgotten the language used by those hon. Gentlemen, in which their sentiments were couched? Had the House forgotten the spirit in which these sentiments had been uttered? It was not for him to say what the motives of these hon. Gentlemen might be. Their motives could only be known "to the Searcher of all hearts." But he would ask, what was the effect of those speeches, conveying the sentiments to which he had adverted? He could put no other construction upon the language than that of showing the people that the House of Commons was itself the head of all Reform. But he would now, with permission of the House, refer to what had transpired out of doors (and quote the language attributed to the hon. member for Middlesex by means of the newspapers, for he had no other authority), at a meeting recently held in one of the metropolitan districts. If Members of that House set such an example to the people, it was no surprise to find the people imitating it. The language of Parliament would not allow him to designate what he thought of such sentiments, so expressed. The hon. member for Middlesex asked at the meeting, after alluding to the introduction of troops in the metropolis, "whether the people of this country would suffer themselves to be deprived of their freedom, and branded as slaves?" This was the language of an incendiary. Then the hon. Gentleman went on to ask the people, "whether they would bend their necks to the yoke which was apparently prepared for them?" The hon. member for Middlesex told the people that 150 persons were opposed to the people, whom he described as being a miserable faction. This was language which could not be misunderstood. Then the conduct towards an Illustrious Personage of the other sex, on the part of the meeting, was odious. They gave "three groans for the Queen." Surely this was a course of proceeding which no man, having the feelings of a man and a Christian, would be envious of partaking in. Was this the way taken to support his Majesty's Government? But if Members of that House used such language at the meetings which had taken place, it was no surprise to find the people acting so shamefully. The hon. and learned Gentleman, whom he did not then see in his place, had given some advice to a meeting which he had attended. He had told them how they might assist the Ministry. It was painful to him to take this course, but he felt it his duty. The language used at the meetings in the country was such as no man would approve of. It was the language of the incendiary and the demagogue, and when the character and agency of this power were taken into consideration, it would be found one day too strong for its master: the brickbat and the missile would teach, ere long, a practical lesson to that effect.

Mr. *Hume* thought that the hon. Member had shown a considerable degree of irritation throughout his speech, which warped his judgment. The complaint of the hon. Gentleman resolved itself into two parts—language spoken in that House, and language uttered by certain Members out of doors. The hon. Member ought at once to have taken down the words which he had uttered, if he considered them of so highly objectionable a nature. He would, however, say, that he had never uttered in that House, nor out of it, sentiments which he shrunk from: and he would challenge any hon. Member to state, if he could, any sentiment that he had made use of in the course of the debates upon this matter, which was unconstitutional. These sentiments might not be palatable to the hon. Gentleman, but he would maintain that they were perfectly constitutional, and such as had been again and again echoed in that House. He threw back with indignation the insinuations of the hon. Member. Any sentiment that he had uttered within the last ten days he was ready to defend, for he had not spoken in anger, but premeditatedly. The hon. Member had asked what was the character of those meetings? He would tell him that their character was that of peace, order, and unanimity. He had certainly stated that it might be a proper course for that House to pursue to stop the Supplies; but was that revolutionary? He would maintain that it was constitutional, and however he might regret the necessity for such a course, yet circumstances might happen which would render it proper. If the hon. Member had looked to the meetings held at Newcastle and other places, he would find that much stronger language had there been used than any which fell from him. The hon. Member had talked of demagogues and incendiaries; but who, he would ask, were the incendiaries? Those who drove the people to madness by their obstinacy, or those who sought to remove the cause of the irritation which existed in the public mind? He would retort on the hon. Member, and those who adopted the same line of conduct that he pursued, the term incendiaries. For his own part, he gloried in the late meetings, for he gloried in seeing the country united in sentiment upon this question, and calling upon their Representatives, if such an Administration as was threatened should be inflicted on the country, to stop the Supplies. The people had carried their object by their moral force; and if any one thing could be more ungrateful than another to the feelings of the hon. Member, and of the other opponents of Reform, it must be their bitter disappointment at finding that the people were not to be goaded into riot and outrage. The people, however, would use only their reason and their judgment, and had shown that they were worthy of their rights, and the means they had taken to obtain them. With respect to what had been said about the expressions he had used at the meeting, he would just say, that he had been informed, while at the meeting, that troops were coming towards the metropolis, and, coupling this with the supposed fact that the Duke of Wellington was Minister, it was not very surprising that he should have inferred as he did, and that he should have said, that the people of England never would submit to be slaves, which they would be in all respects if they submitted to a military Government. He would always act upon the sentiments which he then professed, and he hoped that he should live and die a free man. He had also alluded to the consequences to Europe of the change in the Administration, and he believed he had good reason to congratulate all Europe upon the turn which events had just taken—for Europe was looking to England, and if the latter submitted to a military Government, the hopes of freedom in France, Belgium, and other countries, would be materially depressed. He had reason, therefore, to congratulate the whole civilized world that the yoke which threatened them had been thrown off. England for the last century had been under the dominion of a monopolizing oligarchy, and it now appeared that though the King was anxious to comply with the wishes of the people, yet he was dictated to by individuals who looked only to their own advantage. The hon. Member might think as he pleased about the Reform Bill, but the concession of it would cause the King to live in the hearts of his subjects, and he trusted the latter would soon have the happiness of seeing it become the law of the land.

Mr. *George Bankes* said, he agreed in one thing, and in one thing only, which had fallen from the hon. Member (Mr. Hume), and that was, that his reading of history had been of very little use to him. That hon. Member had talked of slavery; but no slavery could be more base than that of truckling to mob popularity as the basis of any Government. That hon. Member had become a prophet, but he also took care to insure his own predictions, without any regard to the fairness of the means. That hon. Member had shrunk from explaining or apologizing for his improper allusion to the Queen, who was this day, he begged to tell the hon. Member, most grossly insulted in her carriage. If the Tory party could be gratified at the commission of outrages, as the hon. Member had stated, then, indeed, they need only allude to the outrage of that day, and to another which was recently offered to a Bishop in his pulpit. In the late debates in that House, the most exciting language had been used, and the result was, that the speakers at the different public meetings had followed the bad example. His gallant friend had been asked why he had not risen before, when he heard revolutionary language made use of in that House, and the answer was, that he had repeatedly done so, although he had not been able to obtain a hearing. His gallant friend had also risen, a few evenings back, to repel the foul charges which had been made against two brothers of the King, and also when the right hon. Baronet (Sir Francis Burdett) had gone out of his way to malign one of the Judges of the land, who had been sent for by his Sovereign in a moment of greater peril than perhaps any other Sovereign of this country had been exposed to before. In fact, the political conduct of the Government was dangerous to the country, and the cruelty with which they treated their gracious Master was happily hitherto without either parallel or example. Many charges had been made against the Duke of Wellington for changing his opinions; and it was also sought to compare the mode of his resignation with that of the present Ministers. As to the charges they were unfounded; and as to the resignation, it bore no analogy to that of the present Ministers. The Duke of Wellington did not go to his Sovereign with a resignation in one hand, and a threat in the other. The Duke of Wellington did not threaten to dissolve the Parliament. The Duke of Wellington was called upon by that House to resign, and did not the present Secretary-at-War ask his (Mr. Bankes's) right hon. friend (Sir Robert Peel) when the Ministers would resign? The then Opposition Members said, that the fires which had raged could not be put out, nor the peace of the country secured, if the Duke of Wellington did not resign. The noble Duke did resign, and the Special Commissions being sent down were the only fulfilment of the prophecies which were uttered in favour of the present Government. In October last, when the Reform Bill was lost in the House of Lords, by a majority of forty-one, he had stated that the majority would have been greater, but for the creation of Peers who had supported the question, and was proceeding a little further when he was called to order by the noble member for Devonshire, who said, that such allusions to the conduct of the Peers could not be permitted in that House. And yet were not the Anti-reform Peers loaded with the grossest epithets, both in and out of that House? No one could doubt the prerogative of the King to create Peers for the good of his people; but the question here was, should the King be forced to create Peers against his will? The Ministers knew the embarrassment in which their gracious Master was placed, and yet they forced him to agree to a creation of Peers. If, as was stated, any troops had been assembled about the metropolis, it could neither be by the act, nor by the contrivance, of the Duke of Wellington. This was, perhaps, a new piece of history for the hon. Member (Mr. Hume) who, he hoped, when addressing the people for the future, would use the words of truth. That the hon. Member had some power over the people was true, but his abuse of that power was nothing short of the grossest tyranny.

Lord *Althorp* would not be induced to imitate the tone and temper of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, nor would he occupy the House by repelling the attacks of the hon. Gentleman in a manner corresponding to that in which they had been made. He would only say this, that whenever the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers, and the advice which they had given to his Majesty, should come before the House in a regular and proper form, he should be prepared to give what he deemed satisfactory explanations of his own conduct, and to vindicate the conduct of his colleagues so as to place it above reproach. With respect to what the hon. Gentleman had said respecting the resignation of his Majesty's Ministers, he must confess that he was not able to understand the constitutional doctrine of the hon. Gentleman. With respect to the creation of Peers, and the resignation of the Ministry, of which he had had the honour to be a member, all that he should then be induced to say was, that in anything which that Administration had done, they did not intend to menace or threaten any party whatever.

Lord *Stormont* hoped that some of the hon. Members opposite would inform him by whose authority the recent movement of troops had taken place. In asking that question, however, he wished it to be understood that he was not disposed to disapprove of any measures which it had been found necessary to adopt for the preservation of the public peace. He would take this opportunity of giving notice, that on Monday he would call the attention of Ministers and the Attorney General, to certain publications of a libellous and treasonable character, with the view of obtaining from them a declaration of the course which they intended to pursue respecting those publications, and whether they would allow the King and the Queen, whose person ought to be sacred—first, on account of her station; and, secondly, because she was a woman, to be treated in the contumelious, insulting, wicked, and treasonable manner in which they had been treated by the newspapers, or whether they meant to institute actions against the proprietors of those publications?

Mr. *Lamb*, in answer to the hon. Member's first question, said, that he felt no hesitation in declaring that there had been no movement of troops except under the sanction of Ministers. With respect to the noble Lord's second question, if, as he supposed, it referred to what had taken place since Ministers had tendered their resignations, he must state, that they did not feel themselves in a situation to commence prosecutions against any writers. They thought that was a task which might properly be left to those who would have succeeded them. He really did not know to what publications the noble Lord alluded; but it was a matter of consideration for any Government, whether it was prudent to institute prosecutions against publications which would thereby acquire a weight and authority which they had not previously possessed. If the noble Lord's description of the publications were correct, they might safely be left to the contempt of the people, who, he hoped, were now satisfied.

Mr. *Trevor* said, that the hon. member for Middlesex had held the King and Queen up to obloquy at public meetings. He did not believe that any instance could be pointed out in the pages of history, of Ministers submitting to their Sovereign the alternative of accepting their resignation, or of making fifty, sixty, or a larger number of Peers, to carry a particular measure. He was not ashamed of uttering these sentiments, and he trusted he might long have an opportunity of repeating them in this House. The hon. member for Middlesex had professed somewhat ostentatiously his determination to live and die a freeman. God forbid that every Englishman should not be ready to adopt that sentiment. But he would ask the hon. Member to point out, in his intimate acquaintance with the history of the country for the last 100 years the period at which Englishmen had been slaves. He could not refrain from expressing his indignation when he heard such sentiments as those which were said to have been uttered by the hon. member for Middlesex. [Mr. *Hume* intimated his avowal of the sentiments referred to.] The hon. Member admitted all the charges that had been brought against him, and he, as a Member of a British House of Commons, blushed to hear such an admission. He would rather be torn to pieces limb from limb by the rabble of London, than avow sentiments which he considered as disgraceful as they were unmanly.

Mr. *Shaw:* There is one observation of the hon. member for Middlesex, that has not yet been adverted to by any other Member, and upon which I cannot help offering a remark; it was that in which he alluded to the recent excitement, and congratulated the country that during the period of it no breach of the peace had taken place. Now I would ask the hon. Member, whether the gratification he has expressed arises from the mere circumstance of the arrangements having resulted in the accomplishment of his wishes, by the return of the late Ministers to office, or would he have been equally anxious for the maintenance of the public peace and quiet of the country had the result been otherwise? And if the latter be the case, the hon. Member must allow me to say, that the object and the tendency of the language he has used here and elsewhere, are widely different. I cannot, Sir, sit down upon this important occasion, without expressing my humble opinion, that the Duke of Wellington has entitled himself to the deep and lasting gratitude of the country, by his magnanimous though unavailing effort, in the late trying emergency, to rescue the King from the embarrassing and dangerous position in which his Ministers had placed him; and can there be in or out of this House a man of candour, of fairness, or of truth, uninfluenced by political hostility to that noble Duke, who seriously believes that he could have been induced by any private or personal motive to accept office at the present crisis? The question of a Reform of this House of Parliament is absolutely as nothing compared with the question which at the moment the noble Duke was called upon to act, presented itself to the mind of that great man—for it was no less than this, whether the other two estates of the realm were to be overborne by the pledged and clamorous will of this House—whether that democratic torrent which now threatens to desolate the whole country, was at once to deluge the House of Lords, and sap the foundations of the Throne—and a haughty Minister buoyed upon its deceitful surface was to dictate to his Sovereign a surrender of his own independence, by becoming the unwilling instrument to sacrifice the independence, destroy the functions, and annihilate the existence (at least for any useful purpose) of the other branch of the Legislature. Contemporaneously with this, we find that portion of the Press supposed to be the support, and to speak the sentiments, of his Majesty's Ministers, denouncing the sacred person of the King, and contemptuously boasting that although his Majesty had again sent for Earl Grey, that noble Earl did not condescend to obey his summons till the following day—persons, too, of whom better things should be expected, desecrating their rank and station in society, by holding forth at public meetings, our gracious Monarch as a deserter, and an object of scorn and contempt to his people, because, forsooth, he ventured to exercise his prerogative in a point in which above all others, it is unquestionable—the choice of his Ministers. But, Sir, it is in vain to think this state of things can last—let us not deceive ourselves, but manfully meet the question at once—are we to have a monarchy or a republic? For my own part, I protest I would prefer a republic in name to a worse than republic in reality. Nay; rather would I have an honest, open, and professed democracy, than that, under the guise of our ancient and venerated Constitution, the Monarch and hereditary Peers of this once proud and envied nation should be made the degraded tools of their own destruction—the despised engines of a mob tyranny. Sir, the hon. member for Middlesex vaunts of British freedom; I tell him that I am as jealous as he can be of our common birthright as British subjects—to live and die freemen—but I tell him further that while as such he only spurns at military thraldom, I will never bend my neck willingly to the yoke of either military or democratic despotism.

Colonel *Sibthorp* expressed his regret, that the events of the last fortnight had brought the Ministry back to their places. One advantage, however, would result from it, that before long the country would be convinced, that the Ministers were totally inefficient, and incompetent to conduct the affairs of this nation. He must complain that proper explanation had not been given to the House as to the mode in which Ministers proposed to carry the Reform Bill. This Reform Bill was to be a *panacea;* but if it were brought into operation, which he trusted it would not be, the acts of Ministers would be fairly judged and duly rewarded.

Lord *Newark* would not have trespassed

on the attention of the House, had he not held it to be the duty of every independent Member to declare his sentiments at a time like the present. He had supported Ministers on the Reform question from sincere conviction, and he had not hesitated to oppose them where he conceived them to be in the wrong. Without any mixture of party feeling, he could say that he deeply deplored the circumstances which had lately occurred. He must regret that this House should have found itself compelled to tender, in vindication of its honour and consistency, an Address to the Sovereign. He hoped, however, that this proceeding would soon be forgotten, and if referred to, that it would be mentioned merely as matter of history. With regard to the compromise that had been made by certain persons on the subject of Reform, it reminded him of the words of the poet, which he would venture to quote:—

"Behold the hall where Chiefs were late convened,
O dome displeasing unto British eye!
With diadem hight Fool's Cap, lo! a fiend,
A little fiend, that laughs incessantly,
There sits in parchment to be array'd, and by
His side is hung a seal and sable scroll,
Where blazon'd glow names known to chivalry,
And sundry signatures adorn the scroll,
Whereat the urchin points, and laughs with all his soul!
Convention is the dwarfish demon styl'd
That foil'd the Knights in Marialva's dome:
Of brains (if brains they had) he them beguil'd,
And turn'd a nation's early joy to gloom!
For Chiefs like these in vain may laurels bloom."

The people were for the speedy adjustment of the question, and had hitherto preserved tranquillity only from the conviction they entertained that that House was determined to do its duty.

Lord *William Lennox* said, at this momentous crisis, when the people looked with confidence only to the House of Commons to support their rights and liberties, he felt it to be the imperative duty of every individual, fearlessly and firmly to avow his sentiments. He would not have obtruded upon the House had he not been disappointed on this evening in presenting a petition from a most numerous and respectable body of the inhabitants of King's Lynn, who expressed their satisfaction at the recall of his Majesty's late Ministers, and who called upon the House to support those patriotic Ministers in carrying the measure of Reform. In the prayer of the petition he entirely concurred, and until he had an opportunity of presenting it, he would merely confine himself to saying, that to the unmutilated Bill of Reform he would continue to give his most uncompromising support.

Conversation dropped.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, May 21, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Earl of CAWDOR, from Carmarthen, for the Abolition of Slavery.—By Lord FEVERSHAM, from Northallerton, to substitute that place for York for holding the Elections for the North Riding of Yorkshire.—By the Marquis of BUTE, from Greenock, for Relief to the West-India Interests.—By Lord DINORBEN, from Exeter, in favour of the Factories Bill.—By Lord LYNEDOCH, from Perth, Galston, Newmilns, and Irvine, in favour of the Reform Bill.—By the Earl of RODEN, from the Orange Lodge, 1672;—from Leffuny, Carberry, and Edmonton;—and by a NOBLE LORD, from King's Lynn, and East Dereham,—against the Bill.—By Lord WHARNCLIFFE, from Daniel Jarvis, of Margate, to give a Representative to that Place.—By Lord ELLENBOROUGH, from Appleby, to retain its Member.

STOCKTON-ON-TEES.] The Marquis of *Cleveland* presented a Petition from the Mayor and Corporation of Stockton-on-Tees, in the County of Durham, praying to have a Member to represent the town and places adjacent in Parliament. The petition was accompanied by a statement of the increase in the trade of Stockton, to the correctness of which he could vouch. In 1811, the duties paid at the port to the Custom-house were 4,000*l.*; and in 1830 they amounted to 40,000*l.*; making a difference of 36,000*l.* in the latter year as compared with the former. The number and tonnage of vessels entering in and clearing out of the port had increased in proportion. He must take that opportunity to state, that neither in presenting the petition, nor in anything that he had done respecting the measure of Reform, had he the least view to his own private interests, as distinct from those of the public. It was well known that he should be personally a very great loser by the passing of the measure of Reform now before the House, but notwithstanding that, he had strenuously supported it. For the same reason, and on the same principle, he totally disclaimed any views to his own personal interests in anything which he might do to promote the measure or to alter its minor provisions. In looking at this measure he kept totally out of view what had been, were, or might be, his own personal interests, and had acted, and would act, with respect solely to public grounds, and with an eye solely to the interests of the community. He had no view to any interest of his own in the county of Durham when he presented this petition, and he did not take upon himself to say positively that the prayer of it ought to be granted. But at the same time he thought it his duty to present the petition, when called upon by so respectable a body to do so; and he could take upon himself to say, that the statements and the prayer were well worthy of their Lordships' most serious attention. As for himself, he spoke on the subject of Reform as an independent Peer of Parliament. He congratulated the country, and all those who were most anxious to promote the interests of the country, on the restoration to power of the present Ministers. This was a matter on which all parties might well be congratulated, for he was persuaded that the restoration of the present Government was the only means that could have remedied dissatisfaction and prevented revolution. He would not then have troubled their Lordships with any remarks, but that he thought it the duty of every man to come forward in these critical times and boldly avow his opinions.

The Marquis of *Londonderry*, after the disclaimer made by the noble Marquis, could not suppose that, in presenting this petition, the noble Marquis was actuated by any view to his own personal interests. But still the noble Marquis might deem it of importance, from other considerations than his own interests, to promote the object of the petitioners, and to propose that a Member should be given to Stockton; and, if the noble Marquis should think fit so to do, he would support the proposition. He observed, that of the ten Members given to the county of Durham, eight were given to the north, and only two to the south. He certainly thought that this mode of distribution was objectionable, and ought to be amended; and he gave notice, that when they came to consider this part of the Bill, he would propose that the Member should be taken from Gateshead, and given to Stockton. He did not, however, blame the noble Marquis for the distribution made in the Bill, nor did he blame the noble Earl at the head of the Treasury. The arrangement was made by others, and very probably the noble Marquis and noble Earl had nothing to do with it, but it was an arrangement, that ought to be altered.

The Marquis of *Cleveland* was glad that the noble Marquis had turned a Reformer, and that he intended to propose to give a Member to Stockton. At the same time, from his own knowledge of the county of Durham, which was probably not inferior to that of the noble Marquis, he thought it would not be advisable to take the Member from Gateshead. It was the place of the greatest consequence in the county next after those which, claiming to have a Member, had not been objected to.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* did not know what he had said to induce the noble Marquis to think that he had turned Reformer. If they were pressed with such tremendous force from the other side that they must yield, they could not help it; but certainly he was not a Reformer. They might, however, be forced to come to a re-consideration of the details, and then they would, of course, endeavour to render them as little objectionable as possible.

Petition laid on the Table.

CREATION OF PEERS.] The Duke of *Newcastle*, referring to a letter which had appeared in *The Morning Chronicle*, dated Pavilion, 15th May, and which purported to be a letter from his Majesty, pledging himself to the Minister to create as many Peers as might be necessary to carry the Reform Bill, expressed his wish to know, from the noble Earl at the head of the Administration, whether or not that letter was authentic?

Earl *Grey* had no hesitation in answering, that it was not authentic.

The Duke of *Newcastle* said, it gave him very great pleasure to hear it; but he had, on a former night, given notice to their Lordships of his intention to bring forward a motion that would test the opinion of the House as to the prerogative of creating Peers. His motion was intended to refer to that point particularly, but he did not know in what shape it might be most conveniently brought forward. Perhaps the best plan would be, to submit a motion on the state of the nation.

The Marquis of *Cleveland* had expected that the noble Duke would, on consideration, have thought no more of his motion, on discovering that he had no authority to proceed upon; but, at all events, he understood, that the noble Duke intended to limit his motion to the particular point of the prerogative of the Crown to create Peers.

The Duke of *Newcastle* said, it might be more convenient to bring the matter forward in the shape of a motion respecting the state of the nation; and he named Thursday for the motion, and proposed that the Lords should be summoned for that day.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, Thursday might be a very inconvenient day for bringing forward a motion, when the House would be proceeding with the Committee on the Reform Bill. The best plan would be, to watch the progress of the Committee, and then to appoint a convenient day.

The Duke of *Newcastle* was perfectly willing to appoint a day that might be convenient for their Lordships, but he was determined to make his motion.

Earl *Grey* asked, did the noble Duke mean by his motion to question the prerogative of the Crown to make Peers for such an object as this? He was not aware, that there was any limitation to the royal prerogative in the creation of Peers.

The Duke of *Newcastle* did not mean to discuss that question.

Earl *Grey* said, if he understood the noble Duke, it was the exercise of the prerogative he intended to question, and not the prerogative itself.

The Earl of *Eldon* said, there was no man in that House, he supposed, who would dispute the prerogative of the Crown to create Peers; but it was his decided opinion, that the prerogative had been intrusted to the King, not for his personal advantage, but for the purpose of being exercised for the benefit of the people [*cheers*]. He was glad to hear that cheer from the noble Lords opposite; for the prerogative was vested in the Sovereign only for the purpose of being exercised for the benefit of the country; but it would require some better argument than "hear, hear, hear!" to prove that the exercise of the prerogative, in the manner now alluded to, would be an exercise of it for the benefit of the country. He maintained, that the prerogative was given, in order to be exercised wholly for the benefit of the country. He did not mean to say, that the existence of the prerogative ought to be called in question; but, certainly, whether the exercise of it on a particular occasion, or for a particular purpose, was for the benefit of the country, might be made matter of discussion. He maintained, that it was contrary to the duty of the Crown, and to the trust reposed by the Constitution in the Kings of this country, and by virtue of which they reigned, to exercise the prerogative in this manner. He maintained, that it would not only be a departure from the proper exercise of the prerogative, but a most abominable exercise of it, to create Peers for a purpose adverse to the interests of the people. If the prerogative were to be exercised in this manner, the prerogative might continue to exist, but the Crown itself would not long exist.

Lord *Wharncliffe* suggested, that it would be better to defer any discussion on this subject.

The Duke of *Newcastle* wished to know from the noble Lord on the Woolsack, whether it was his intention to institute any proceedings against the paper in which the letter to which he had adverted had been published?

The *Lord Chancellor* had only to repeat, what he had lately before said on a similar occasion, and that was, that the consideration of what ought or ought not to be made the subject of prosecution did not belong to his situation. The letter appeared to be entirely fictitious; but, supposing it became a question whether it was or was not a libel, it was not for him to give any opinion about it, as the matter might come before him and the rest of their Lordships for judgment in the last resort. His noble friend had already stated, that the letter was fictitious, and what proceedings might be necessary was quite another question. He begged leave to remind the noble Duke, that he was not the public prosecutor.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND—COMMITTEE—SECOND DAY] Earl Grey moved the Order of the Day for the House going into a Committee on the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill.

Order of the Day read.

The Earl of *Roden* said, before their Lordships went into Committee on this Bill, he thought himself called upon again to refer to the subject of the creation of Peers for the particular purpose of carrying this measure—a question which was essentially connected with the independence of their Lordships' House. They had heard, from the noble Lord at the head of the Ministry, that he had now a reasonable hope—nay, even a confident expectation—that he would be enabled to carry this measure through their Lordships' House, without any alteration in its essential provisions. Now, he had listened to every thing that had been said by their Lordships on the subject, to hear from whom the noble Earl had derived this confident expectation, and he had not heard one word which could afford to the noble Lord a reasonable hope that the Bill would be passed by that House. He was sorry, however, to find, that there did appear some ground to suspect a secession of some noble Lords from an active opposition to the Bill. For his own part, he thought it a matter of little consequence whether the measure was to be carried by swamping that House by a creation of Peers, or by the preventing some of their Lordships from giving their votes against it. He felt that it was a matter of little consequence whether the independence of that House was destroyed in the one way or the other; but, at the same time, he felt that it was a duty which he owed to those who had assisted him in supporting the Protestant interest in Ireland, and the liberties of the country, not to lend his aid in any way to the forwarding a measure which, in his opinion, would be destructive of the Monarchy and the Constitution of the country. He would be no *particeps criminis* with the Ministers in so foul a deed as that of having Peers created for this particular purpose. Let the responsibility rest on the heads of the Ministers themselves; and he hoped that their Lordships would not lend themselves to the purposes of the Ministers, on any account, or in any way. For his own part, he had always thought, that a straightforward line of conduct was the best, and that a different course of proceeding was, in the long run, almost sure to terminate in a failure. He was one of those who always thought that the majority in that House would not be swamped by a creation of Peers, and he still continued of opinion, that no Peers would be created for this purpose. He had received many benefits from the illustrious House of Brunswick, and was for that, as well as for many other reasons, strongly attached to that House. But he would rather that our present Sovereign should abdicate, than that he should disgrace himself by bringing dishonour on the country. He had lamented the course that some noble Lords had taken with respect to the second reading of the Bill; he thought that course was wrong, and the result showed, that a straightforward course of conduct was the best. The noble Earl at the head of the Administration had stated, on former occasions, that he looked forward to the passing of the Bill as the great means for restoring complete repose and tranquillity. He differed widely from the noble Earl on that subject; and, from every thing that he saw passing around him, he thought that he was most likely to be right. Neither from what he saw passing in England, nor from what he saw passing in Ireland, did he entertain any hope that repose would be the result of passing this measure. Would those who were so riotous now out of the House of Commons be less riotous when the doors of the House should be thrown open to them? A House of Commons under the Bill would not be satisfied without a cheap Government, and there would be no power to prevent this cheapness from being carried to any length. As to Ireland, he could speak more positively, and could take upon himself to say, that the consequence of passing the Irish Reform Bill would be the separation of Ireland from this country. He could show that such was the object of those in Ireland who were the chief supporters of Reform. He could prove it from the declaration of Mr. O'Connell, who went straightforward to his object, and that object was, the destruction of the Protestant interest in Ireland. In that well-known declaration, Mr. O'Connell assured his partizans, that, in the first Session of a Reformed Parliament, he would bring forward a proposition for a Repeal of the Union, and that he felt confident of being able to do so with the best prospect of success. There was also the declaration of a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, the right reverend Dr. Macabe, against the Established Church of Ireland, the realization of both being contingent upon the passing of the Reform Bill. That Established Church, let him tell their Lordships, formed the strongest link by which Ireland and England were held in connexion, and against that, and against the Protestants of Ireland, in whose welfare he, at all times, felt the deepest interest, and whose affection and attachment it should be the first duty of the Legislature to cultivate, that Establishment, and the Protestants of Ireland were the objects of Dr. Macabe's denunciation. Of the effect produced upon the Protestant mind of Ireland by the Bill he need hardly speak to their Lordships; he need hardly tell them of the sentiments it produced upon men's minds, from one end of Ireland to the other, according as they were or were not favourably inclined towards the Established Church. They well understood the *animus* which influenced the supporters of Reform in this country. Neither they, nor he, nor any man who used his eyes, could be insensible to the emblems of revolution now apparent in our streets—the tri-colour was displayed in open day in the streets of this metropolis. No man who looked at the signs of the times could question the revolutionary tendencies of the Bill—there was no man who read the history of other nations, and, above all, who read the history of other revolutions, could allow a doubt to enter his mind that it had, or could have, any other tendency. He felt that at that moment, and when addressing them on that subject, he was speaking at a moment when their independence was in the most imminent danger. There was a time when the Members of that House were looked up to with respect, and there would be little danger of their losing that respect if they were only true to themselves, and fearlessly performed the duty which the Constitution assigned to them—a duty, the performance of which was peculiarly imperative upon them at a crisis like the present, for the independence of that House—the second branch of the Legislature—was the matter which hung upon their decision respecting the Reform Bill. That Bill was now brought to them from the House of Commons, for the second time, and the question was, would they now, under the influence of intimidation, give way? They had been told, that there was popular clamour out of doors, and that, if they presumed to resist that clamour and give an independent vote in that House, nothing less than total demolition would ensue. Could he believe his own ears—was it to be asserted as a fact, that England was so low, and the dignity of her Peers so lost, that they were to be influenced by intimidation out of doors? Was it a fact that, even before the blow was struck by arbitrary power, the Peers of England would relinquish their independence? Was it at that time of day that the Peers of England, whose independence had hitherto been their proudest boast, were ready to relinquish that independence for ever—that they, the second branch of the Legislature—that they, who had hitherto stood as a barrier to resist the floods of popular excitement on the one hand, and the encroachments of the Crown on the other, should, almost without a struggle, give up their privileges? They knew that the prerogatives of the Monarch could not be successfully assailed unless through the House of Commons, and they filled the space between—they knew that the just rights of the people could not be subverted otherwise than through the Houses of Parliament, and the House of Lords had at all times been the sound and constitutional agent for resisting those encroachments. He entreated them, then, to preserve the privileges they had derived from their ancestors, and as no gagging bills had yet been passed, to say to the measure of Reform, Not Content.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* had never expected that he should live to see the day when, after forty years of public service that had earned the respect of all parties, the noble Earl (Grey) should come down to that House, and endeavour, by violence and compulsion, to carry a measure which, to say the least, was fraught with serious peril to all the existing institutions of the country. Indeed, the circumstances had given rise to such mingled feelings of pain and sorrow, that he had not language to express himself as he felt. What difference did it make to them, so far as their legislative independence was concerned, whether the Bill was carried by an addition to, or a subtraction from, their Members? Besides, were they sure that the blow which the secession of some of their Lordships was meant to avert was, after all, but suspended by the noble Earl, and that he would effect his creation of Peers after the Bill had passed into a law? What would be their course then—he meant of those who purposed to leave the noble Earl and his colleagues in undisputed possession of the field? Would they not forfeit the confidence of that respectable class out of doors who had supported them in their opposition to the Bill? He was free to admit, that a large majority of the public was favourable to its principles, but still maintained, that a very respectable and intelligent portion of the community partook of the sentiments of a majority in that House, and would justly feel dissatisfied if any of them abandoned the post of duty. He was very anxious, before they proceeded further, to ascertain from the noble Earl what were the actual grounds or principles of the several clauses and schedules of the Bill, for he had been given to understand (he was not himself a calculator) that Lieutenant Drummond's calculations were theoretically erroneous; and he knew that some boroughs in schedule A exceeded some in schedule B in wealth, population, and the means of furnishing an independent constituency. He wished, therefore, to know whether population assessed taxes, or constituent wealth, was the basis of the clauses which they were about to discuss?

The Earl of *Winchilsea* rose, as an independent man, in a House which was no longer independent, to state the course which he would have pursued had the independence of that House not been fatally destroyed by Ministers. If a foreign despot had landed on these shores, and tendered him life on the condition of his ceasing to defend the institutions of his country, he would have spurned the offer, and with his last breath fought for those institutions. In the same spirit would he do battle to the last in defence of the institutions of the State—of the independence of that House as a deliberative branch of the Legislature—and in support of the monarchy, all of which would be endangered by the noble Earl's Bill. It had been suggested to him that his doing so would then be worse than useless, and, indeed, could only add to the triumph of the noble Earl. He was not to be influenced by such a suggestion, but would pursue the stern path of duty undismayed; and, confident that when the public mind had recovered, as it shortly would, from the delusion into which it had artfully been thrown with respect to the Reform Bill, it would do justice to him and those who, with him, would keep the standard of opposition to such parts of the Bill as they conceived to be injurious to the interests of the country, unfurled to the last. Yes, the public mind was deluded and forced into a state of unnatural excitement by a daring Press, which lorded it over the Government and Parliament; but a re-action would soon take place, and then the infatuated men who were weak enough in that House to desert the post of danger, would see that they had indirectly been assisting a measure fraught with their own ruin and the ruin of the country. He was one who had no sordid lust of place—no morbid thirst of the emoluments and privileges of office—no interest whatever in parliamentary corruption, and, therefore, he was not obnoxious to the charge of being actuated by unworthy motives in pertinaciously opposing the Bill. He felt that he was only honestly discharging his duty in resisting a measure of mischief, and he could not be too grateful to his Majesty for resisting a counsel which implied the most cruel and unfair insult upon the dignity and independence of that House that was ever offered to any body of independent gentlemen.

Lord *Ellenborough* would act, during the remaining stages of the Bill, just as if none of the events of the last fortnight had occurred; and he trusted their Lordships would, were it only from considerations of their own dignity and usefulness, conduct the discussion in the Committee with temper and calmness. He respected the motives of those noble Lords who deemed it best to abstain altogether from participating in the passing of a measure which they were unable to resist; but he thought he best consulted the permanent interests of the country, by endeavouring to the last to discharge his duty in his place there, and he relied on the country being grateful for his exertions after it had recovered from its present temporary delusion.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* would withdraw his opposition to the Bill (as the lesser evil in a choice of evils), if the noble Earl would explicitly state that he had his Majesty's permission to carry the Bill by means of a creation of Peers. He was as much opposed as ever to the principle and provisions of the Bill; but, preferring the Bill by itself as a less evil than the Bill accompanied by the swamping of that House, he would forego his opposition, in order to prevent the necessity of the menaced creation. He wished, therefore, the noble Earl would state explicitly whether he had the King's promise to make Peers, if necessary to the carrying the Bill. At present they knew not how matters really stood, for the noble Earl had wrapped himself up in mystery, from which no obstetrical ingenuity that had yet been tried could extract anything. He knew that the sword of power was hanging over them, and they knew not the moment when it might fall. It was, no doubt, unimportant whether the new Peers came in as one body, or in driblets of threes or fours; the liveried lacqueys were to be inflicted on them, and the mode was, he agreed, a matter of secondary consideration. He was glad, however, to find that even a scion of the noble Earl's own stock—that the son (Lord Howick) of the noble Earl himself had sufficient Whig blood in his veins to refuse being called up to that House upon such "lacquered livery terms." A noble Earl (Mulgrave) had threatened to remind a noble Duke (Wellington) of his having abandoned his solemn pledges, by each night reading to him his protest against Reform, should he accept office on the condition of carrying a measure of Reform; he would remind the noble Earl (Grey) of his pledge against every measure, like the menaced creation of Peers, calculated to affect the independence of that House. The words of the noble Earl, delivered in that House on the 13th of June, 1827, were most emphatic, and applicable to the present crisis. 'If I am 'told,' said the noble Earl, 'that we run 'the risk of having a worse bill, I shall never 'suffer myself to be intimidated by any 'such threats, and if a worse bill should 'be sent up, I am sure your Lordships 'would pursue the course you have pur'sued by the present Bill. You would 'consider it, and you would amend it, and, 'if you could not make it good, you would 'reject it. I am sure that any such mea'sure shall be met by me with a firm op'position, and that I shall be prepared to 'do my duty to myself. I have said thus 'much, and I might say a great deal more. 'If there should come a contest between 'this House and a great portion of the 'people, my part is taken, and with that 'order to which I belong I will stand or 'fall. I will maintain to the last hour of 'my existence the privileges and inde'pendence of this House.'* He would ask the noble Earl, was he prepared now to stand or fall by his order? Or was he, in the face of this emphatic declaration, about to adopt a course of proceeding destructive of their "privileges and independence?"

Viscount *Gage* said, hopes were held out that the House would be allowed to perform its duty, and deliberate with respect to the particular clauses of the Bill so long as noble Lords abstained from attacking the principle of the measure; but he sincerely regretted that those hopes now turned out to be completely unfounded, and that there was not the slightest chance of changing a single particle of the Bill. Such being the case, the question for the opponents of the measure resolved itself into this—"would they become parties to a destruction of the Constitution?" This at once changed the matter from a political to a moral question, and evinced that the opponents of the Bill must dare the worst in the conscientious discharge of their duty. If Earl Grey would compel the King to do an act which his Majesty would willingly avoid, let the noble Earl be responsible for the proceeding. Nothing remained for the Anti-Reform Peers but to stand firm, and, as he had before, said, to do their duty.

The Duke of *Buckingham* imputed blame to no man for his motives or conduct, but was desirous of doing what he conceived to be his duty. He was in his place as a Peer of Parliament, and he was determined to remain, and would not on any account, or for any purpose, withdraw from the discharge of his duty. The noble Earl had retired from office, on the ground of his Majesty's refusal to create Peers, and, notwithstanding the noble Lord's resumption of his official duties, the House had no right to assume that the King would break his royal word. If, however, they should find reason to believe his Majesty had given way to the noble Earl's advice, and consented to make Peers, it would then become their Lordships' duty to consider what was due to their insulted honour and dignity. At present, he thought the best thing they could do was, to go into Committee, and make such amendments as they thought necessary in the Bill.

The Earl of *Wicklow* said, that although he had been anxious to throw out the Bill, which he considered dangerous, and the incapable Ministry who proposed it, he had yet determined not to offer in Committee any opposition to the principle of the Bill. With respect to the creation of Peers, when he considered of what materials the Government was composed, he was not surprised at their having given such advice to the Monarch: he knew he was using a word disagreeable to the noble Earl, who had the other night protested against the use of the term monarchy, as the Deputies in another country had against the word subject; but he really was surprised at certain noble Lords who supported the Ministry agreeing to a degradation of their order, and of that lofty station which they derived from a long line of ancestry. As far as that Bill was concerned, he felt happy that it was left in the hands of its proposers. If any benefit resulted from it, they were entitled to the praise; if any evil, they should be made to pay the penalty. Considering, therefore, that the responsibility should be entirely on them, he would neither thwart nor oppose them in any thing which they deemed essential. He would neither do so with respect to the English, the Scotch, nor the Irish Bills. He was anxious to see how the Ministers would extricate themselves from the slough in which they had plunged. He could not believe that, in defiance of all their pledges, they would give up the Irish Bill; and if they once passed it, they must know and feel that the total disseverment of the two countries would be the inevitable consequence. He trusted, however, that before the edifice they were raising should be completed, the true sense of the country would be restored—the people would recover their senses, and blow down with one breath the flimsy fabric they had begun to raise.

---

* Hansard's Debates, (third series,) vol. xvii, p. 1261.

Earl *Manvers* had supported the principle of the former Reform Bill, from an honest conviction that it was called for by the country, and in consequence of the same, or a still stronger feeling, he had supported the present measure. If the former Bill had not been stifled in its birth, he should (as now) have deemed himself an unshackled agent, fully at liberty to consider its details in the Committee. He meant to proceed in the same way now, and should support or oppose particular clauses, according to his notion of their respective merits. Much had been said about a creation of Peers, and the best means of avoiding that measure; but if the deluge were at the door, and his breath could stay its progress, he would act on his own sense of right and justice, without reference to any other consideration, leaving the responsibility with the authors of the act.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* was convinced, that if the two opposing parties could now meet in a spirit of conciliation, the whole country would look upon this night as one of the happiest and most fortunate. He deprecated further preliminary discussion, and recommended their Lordships to proceed to the Committee at once, with calmness, temper, and moderation.

The Duke of *Newcastle* would put a question to Earl Grey, to which he requested the favour of a direct answer. What he wished to know was, whether the noble Earl would allow of any alteration in any of the clauses in Committee?

Earl *Grey* really did not know what answer to make to the noble Duke, and could state nothing in reply, except that which every individual Member would naturally say with respect to a similar question, if put to him. The House was going into Committee, and the noble Duke asked, would he allow of any alterations in the Bill? To this question it was not possible to answer directly, but he would put the noble Duke's question and his own reply in a more parliamentary shape; and if the noble Duke asked him, in the event of alterations being proposed in Committee, what would be his conduct, his answer was—he would discuss the alterations, and if they appeared to him beneficial changes in the Bill, they should have his assent; but if he thought them of an opposite character, he would oppose them with all his might.

The House in Committee.

Earl Grey moved that schedule C stand part of the Bill.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, their Lordships would recollect, that when the House was discussing the postponement of the disfranchising clauses, he gave notice, that if his noble and learned friend's amendment were agreed to, he would propose, as an amendment on the present clause, the names of the places to which he and his noble friends thought it expedient to give enfranchisement. He thought it desirable to take the earliest opportunity to show their sincerity, and to prove that they had not postponed the disfranchisement clause for the purpose of marring the Bill, but with a view to introduce the enfranchisement clauses in what they conceived the proper order. They also wished to have it known, in the first instance, what towns they deemed it necessary to enfranchise. He rejoiced that the moment had arrived when an opportunity offered of explaining more in detail than it was possible to do a fortnight ago, not only the amendments which he and his noble friends then proposed to offer, but which they still meant to suggest, for no alteration had taken place in the course they proposed to pursue. It was not only his own view of the case, but that of all his noble friends, that their Lordships' vote in favour of the second reading of the Bill had entirely changed the position of the measure. Up to that moment he and his friends were decidedly opposed to the principle of the Bill. True it was, that its principle and details had received the sanction of the House of Commons, but it was the sanction of a House of Commons elected under peculiar circumstances of excitement and delusion, and, under such circumstances, the decision of the Commons did not carry that weight with it which it would had the House been elected at a period of tranquillity. But the moment their Lordships, who were then independent, agreed to the second reading, he and his friends felt it necessary to submit to what was inevitable, for the principle of the Bill must be carried; so that, though disapproving of the principles and details of the measure to a great extent, yet, believing that the principle must be established, they thought it their duty to propose such amendments as might render the measure more safe in operation and more permanent than if passed in its present shape. They were desirous of avoiding a collision with the other House of Parliament—they were desirous of giving not the slightest pretext to Ministers to go to their Sovereign with that advice which they had offered. Every amendment was framed with these views, and, to use the noble Earl's phraseology, "he entertained a confident expectation" that the Commons would have acceded to the amendments. He repeated, their only object was, to make the measure safe, but, above all, firm; for of all the evils of great changes like the present, the greatest mischief was, that they generally led to further alterations. And to render the measure firm it was, that they thought it better for enfranchisement to precede disfranchisement. They were desirous of giving security of possession to towns to be enfranchised, and thought this would be best accomplished by enfranchising those towns on their own merits, without reference to the disfranchisement of other places. Then came the question, on what principle should enfranchisement proceed? It was important not to give rise to a continued demand for future changes. Had they said, wherever there existed a certain mass of population, paying a certain amount of taxes, within certain bounds and limits, Representation should be granted, new towns, as they started up, would have put forward claims to Representation as they acquired those elements of the franchise. They, therefore, rejected this principle as one which would lead to many future changes, and thought it better to proceed on a different plan. They thought that, wherever they found united with a large amount of population, a considerable degree of wealth, and peculiar interest requiring Representation; and wherever they saw, that Representation would not only be of advantage to the particular town, but also to the public at large, it would be expedient to grant Representation to such towns, while they withheld it from others not possessed of similar claims. The towns which they proposed to enfranchise were twenty in number, and they were to receive two Members each; there were also two places in Wales, Merthyr Tydvil, and Swansea, to which it was proposed to give one Member each, no town in that part of the country having more. Thus it was designed to give forty-two Members to towns supposed to possess good claims to Representation. If their Lordships looked to the original Reform Bill, they would find that it distributed only thirty-one Members among the manufacturing interests; but by this plan it was proposed to give eleven more. This was in part effected by giving two Members to towns that had had only one allotted them. They proposed to do away with schedule B and schedule D altogether, thinking that, if a place could be fitted to return one Member it might easily be rendered fit to return two, and being of opinion that the second Member was desirable, as representing the minority. If a town were unfit to have two Members, on account of impurity, &c., neither was it fit to have one. He thought it better, therefore, that every town in England should have a second Member, for, if not, there would be no end to the demands of rising towns, that one Member should be taken away from those in a less flourishing condition to be conferred upon them. It would be curious to see to what extent those claims would go, if population and wealth alone were to be taken as a test for enfranchisement. In the first place, Croydon could establish as good a claim as Whitby to Representation upon this principle, although there were twenty-five places on the list between these two towns. Indeed, he could show, too, that no less than twenty-five places could prove a greater claim to one Member than the large towns it was proposed to enfranchise to two. But they thought it desirable to place a decided bar against such claims. By retaining the places in schedule B on their present basis of Representation, they hoped to retain something of the ancient system and to secure among other benefits, the possibility of colonial Representation. With respect to the balance of Members touched by schedule A (to the extent of which, as stated on a former evening, he was willing to disfranchise), the question arose, should they be disposed of in the shape of additional Members to counties? It was evident that all schedule A might be rendered pure by the addition to the boroughs of rural districts, and, consequently, that to destroy nomination boroughs it was not necessary to destroy the boroughs in schedule A; for the same process would render schedule A pure by which it was proposed to purify schedule B. But they considered, that, although it was not so stated in the Bill, it was presumed the House by its vote had condemned to destruction all nomination boroughs; therefore, the question with them was, whether they should reserve the number of towns above twenty-one in schedule A, to unite them with rural districts, or whether they should increase the number of county Members. They decided in favour of the counties. Considering it, however, better that there should not be three Members for any county, they resolved upon reserving seven Members to schedule B, instead of conferring them upon the counties. Thus, upon the whole, it would appear that three-fifths of the enfranchisement was intended for counties. He thought it would, perhaps, be now desirable that he should read to their Lordships the names of the towns which would be contained in the Motion with which it was his intention to conclude. These towns were Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, Sunderland, Wolverhampton, Bolton, Bradford, Blackburn, Halifax, Macclesfield, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stockport, Stroud, Frome, Huddersfield, Kidderminster, Warrington, Whitby, and Tynemouth. It had been proposed by he Bill before their Lordships, to give hree Members to the hundred of Salford, in the county of Lancaster, and looking to that county, its locality, connexion, situation, and importance, he conceived that it should have as many Members as the county of York; but to the mode in which it was proposed to have given ten Members to the county of Lancaster, he could not but dissent. He would give the hundred of Salford two Members; and as Blackburn was to have two Members, there would be four Members added to the manufacturing interests in the county. To the agricultural hundreds north of the Ribble, they proposed to give two Members more, and the division of the south the same number. In this plan he conceived there were many advantages. He now came to the qualification in towns provided by the Bill then under consideration, and he complained that it gave to artizans and to journeymen, rights to which they were not entitled, and which rights ought to be intrusted to those individuals who had capital in those towns to be enfranchised by the Bill, or which already enjoyed the privilege of sending Representatives to Parliament. To place the elective franchise in the journeymen artizans in manufacturing towns, he could not but think was really conferring no privilege at all; for, when it was remembered the frequent combinations which ensued from time to time in all manufacturing districts, the servants would maintain over their employers the right of returning a Representative or Representatives to Parliament, and the employer, who, as a matter of course, was the capitalist, having a stake in the country, would be unrepresented, save by the Members of the county in which the town might be situated. As the Bill now stood, it provided a Representation in Parliament for the workman, and not for the master, and this boon was to be extended to the artizan, while not one agricultural labourer would have a vote. With reference to the proposition of his Majesty's Government for the enfranchisement of the metropolitan districts, and as provided in the Bill, he should reserve his sentiments until that provision came immediately before their Lordships for consideration; but this he would say, that notwithstanding all he had heard and read, and after serious and deliberate consideration on his part, it was his firm conviction that such a provision would not tend to the advantage of the metropolitan districts themselves, while, at the same time, it would prove detrimental to the interests of the public. He, also, could not but remind their Lordships, that more than one half of the population of those districts would, under the proposed new law, have votes for the county—a right which at present, under the law as it stands, did not exist; and he begged to ask their Lordships, would not the extension of the franchise to the metropolitan districts only serve for the extension of that system to which he had already alluded—namely, the placing power in the hands of the lower classes? He begged their Lordships also to consider the character of the men who would be returned for those places in revolutionary times, and the mischievous influence which would be exercised over the rest of the country by these metropolitan elections, combined with the power of the metropolitan Press. Besides, the respectable tradesmen, unwilling to disoblige their customers of different opinions, would, perhaps, prefer declining to vote altogether, or, if not, they would be sure to be precluded from exercising the right by the violence of their own journeymen. Should any noble Lord doubt the proposition he had now offered, he would again inquire if there had really and truly been a free election for Members to serve in Parliament for the city of Westminster for many years past? The 10*l.* qualification, as proposed by the Bill itself, was not by any means the principle of the Bill, and it sustained the alterations which it was the intention of noble Lords as well as himself to propose with reference to the details of the measure. It had not appeared advisable to noble Lords with whom he acted to raise the qualification, but it had been much doubted whether it would not be possible to obtain a much more respectable constituency. At the same time, it was not wished to deprive poverty of the elective franchise, provided that that poverty was respectable. It had also been agreed, that residence on the premises out of which the claim to vote arose should be indispensable, and also, that no lodger should be held entitled to that privilege, nor was it thought essential to require that the rent should be paid half-yearly—a system which was considered dangerous, and it was, therefore, proposed only to inquire and ascertain, according to the opinion to be obtained, that the man claiming the right to vote, however poor, was respectable. Such was the plan proposed by noble Lords sitting on his side of the House—not a plan of Reform, but one of amendment—a plan which would make the Bill much more safe and more conservative than it appeared to them to be. Much as many of his noble friends were astonished with the short statement which he had on a former evening made of the extent to which he was prepared to go, he now begged to remark, that by throwing the Representation open to the towns to which he had referred, there would have been a diminution of eighteen Members, by which an advantage of at least thirty-six votes would be gained; and in the seventy-six divisions to which the counties had been reduced, fifty votes, which, on a division, would be equal to 100, would be given to the conservative party. The effects of the amendments to which he had now called their Lordships' attention would have been to preserve the Church and Constitution, and which would have kept also 136 votes to the conservative party on any division. The system to be established by the Bill could not stand without a more popular franchise than that proposed being created in some places; indeed, no representative system could stand which excluded altogether the poorest class of society from the elective franchise; and he was, therefore, an advocate for the principle of the existing system, which, while it gave security to property, enabled the country to afford, without danger to itself, direct Representation to poverty. He submitted to their Lordships, whether or not it would be expedient to preserve, in many places, those rights, with reference to the elective franchise, which the population of that town had so long enjoyed. In reference to these last points he begged to say, that he had been greatly misunderstood when he was supposed to have intimated his intention to move any amendments to this effect, or that he, in offering such observations as had occurred to him, was acting with the concurrence of others. On the occasion to which he alluded, he spoke his own individual sentiments and opinions, and at the same time he was ready to admit, that the question as to preserving the franchise in those places was one of such difficulty that he had not brought his mind to a decision upon the subject. A noble Lord had also, on the other evening, referred to some sentiments which had fallen from him (Lord Ellenborough) with reference to the Scotch Reform Bill. Looking to that measure, and to the system of Scotch Representation—a system which abounded with abuse such as was unknown in the system of English Representation—he was prepared to admit that he should not oppose the second reading of the Scotch Reform Bill. He made this admission after having looked through the details of the Bill, but he was not prepared to go the same length with respect to the measure of Reform proposed for Ireland. He had stated in that House, fifteen months ago, that he could not vote for that measure after the part he had taken, and the advocacy he had used, in order to carry the measure of Roman Catholic emancipation. The noble Lords opposite were in the same position as himself, as regarded this subject; inasmuch as they had advocated and used every exertion to carry that measure—a measure which was accompanied by another bill, which was considered as a security against any dangers which might be supposed to originate from the provisions of the first bill. The noble Lords opposite, as well as himself, stood pledged to the Protestants of Ireland and this country—a pledge from which he should not depart, unless the Protestants of England and Ireland joined in agreeing to the measure proposed by his Majesty's Government for a Reform in the Representation of the sister kingdom in the Imperial Parliament. The measure, as it stood, would, if it became the law of the land, have the effect of overturning all that had been done, on the occasion to which he had alluded, to preserve the Protestant Constitution of both countries secure and inviolate. He, therefore, could not, as a Peer of Parliament, and as a man of honour, support or vote for the Irish Bill of Reform until he was relieved from the pledge he had undertaken by the Protestant population of both England and Ireland. He would not now further trespass on the attention of their Lordships, than to move that the towns which he had already read be substituted for those enumerated in schedule C.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that his noble friend near him (Earl Grey) proposed to leave the clause as it now stood to their Lordships, with the power to discuss separately the merits of, and to vote upon, each borough to which the clause had reference. To prevent all mistakes, it would be well that their Lordships should understand the purport of the noble Baron's Amendment, which he understood to be, the adoption of the schedule which the noble Baron had enumerated, in place of that attached to the Bill before their Lordships. The noble Baron, of course, proposed his Amendment, subject to the same process as that proposed by his (the Lord Chancellor's) noble friend with reference to the boroughs contained in schedule C, namely, that each town should be discussed separately, and on its own merits. He now came to the observations which had fallen from the noble Baron. The noble Baron had entered into the general history of the plan of Reform proposed by his Majesty's Government, and the plan of amendment which the noble Baron had intended to propose; or, in other words, the Government having proposed one plan of Reform, the noble Baron and other noble Lords came forward with another plan by way of amendment. He considered it would be vain and useless to trouble their Lordships with a discussion on words, for the Motion of the noble Baron was, in substance, that their Lordships should adopt his plan of amendment, and reject the ministerial plan of Reform. In the observations he was about to offer to their Lordships, he should abstain from any reference to what had occurred in this House on that day fortnight, further than to observe, that his Majesty's Government could not be considered much to blame for not having discovered the purport or object of the motion which led to the discussion on that occasion, and which had been withheld from the knowledge of the Government until the numbers of the division were announced. He hoped that the measure now before their Lordships would not only be regarded as, but would really prove to be, a settlement of the question of a Reform of the Parliamentary Representation of the country; and therefore, any part of the Bill that appeared to him to be, in the least degree, likely to sow the seeds of any new or further changes, he should regard as an argument against the measure itself, and any mode more calculated to lead to a settlement of that question, or less likely to sow the seeds of a demand for a further change, he, if such were proposed, should consider as an improvement. The noble Baron had doubtless included in his list a number of towns of great importance and consequence, but he begged to call the attention of their Lordships to the towns enumerated in schedules B and C (for their Lordships were considering both), which were of equal importance, both with respect to wealth and population; and he could not conceive on what principle it was, that the noble Baron should oppose the claims of a town now containing but 5,000, but which, in a few years, might contain 25,000 inhabitants—or of a sea-port possessing no trade, but becoming an extensive commercial port—or an inland town destitute now of manufactures, but arriving to a high rank in the trading world, being taken into consideration by the Legislature, some ten or twenty years hence. In reference to the towns to be enfranchised by the Bill, he must observe, that the argument which had been used by the noble Baron was not applicable to the test by which the Government had tried them; nor could he agree to the argument of the noble Baron that the towns in schedule A could, by the addition of the rural districts to their respective constituencies, equal those enumerated in the other schedules. In some parts of the country such a system was entirely inapplicable—in Cornwall, for instance, where the boroughs lay so thick, and which furnished eleven or twelve boroughs to schedule A, and four to schedule B. He also denied the position taken by the noble Baron, that the 10*l.* qualification, either in small or large towns, would place the elective franchise in the hands of journeymen tradesmen, or the humbler classes of society; and what, on the other hand, would have been the result if the qualification had been increased to 20*l.* instead of 10*l.*? Let noble Lords refer to towns not named in any of the schedules, but which are already represented; the result would be, that the franchise would be narrowed, and not extended. In Sudbury, for example, which contained a population of 5,500 persons, there would be, under a 20*l.* qualification, but sixty votes: those sixty votes would never, by any possibility, all poll at one period, because a deduction must be made for persons disqualified from voting—such as females, or others who fall in their qualification under the exigency of residence. Deducting one-fourth for persons thus disqualified, the numbers remaining would be but forty-five, which number might again be further reduced by the non-residence of householders; so that, of a population of 5,500 individuals, about thirty-five would have the elective franchise under the 20*l.* qualification, while, under the 10*l.* qualification, the number of electors would be upwards of 300: so also in the case of Marlow, which contained 6,000 inhabitants, with fifty 20*l.* houses, which would only have about thirty-eight voters: Penrhyn and Falmouth, with 11,800 inhabitants, would only have thirty-six voters; Poole only seventy-five voters, if all were resident; Harwich, with a population of 4,300, would have only thirty-five voters. The case was precisely similar in the instances of Cockermouth, Warwick, and many other towns. He would now turn to the effect a 20*l.* qualification would have on the towns to be enfranchised, and contained in schedules C and D, and see what the effect would be upon them as compared with the 10*l.* qualification; and first he would name Leeds, which contained 123,000 inhabitants, and 5,000 houses of the annual value of 10*l.*, while, if the qualification was 20*l.*, the number of voters would be but 2,400. In Wolverhampton, under the 20*l.* qualification, between 300 and 400 persons only out of a population of 67,000 inhabitants would be entitled to vote. Birmingham, also, which contained 142,000 inhabitants, would only have, under the 20*l.* qualification, between 1,800 and 1,900 voters, and that only if all were resident; so it was in a similar proportion with all the towns, some of which even were much stronger instances than those he had named to their Lordships. In answer to what had been urged by the noble Baron, that power would be placed in the hands of the artizan superior to the master, he would name two facts. In a large town he had been informed, that in a manufactory, in which were daily employed 140 respectable workmen, of that number only four would become entitled to vote under the provisions of this Bill. In another manufactory, out of 180 workmen, there was not one entitled to vote. He heartily and deeply regretted that such should be the fact, but, at the same time, he could see the necessity of establishing and maintaining a strict line. After these facts it could not be urged that the masters would be outvoted by their workmen. The noble Baron was for retaining the scot-and-lot system of voters in some of the boroughs, on the ground that the doing so would impart greater safety and security to the general system of Representation: he, for his part, could not see how the adopting of such a proceeding could be beneficial, either in theory or in practice. Where would be the use, indeed he would say the common sense, in telling the people in Manchester, Leeds, and other large places, that they would be better off, and that their interests were likely to be more secure, because in Preston, and places like that, the system of voting was totally independent of property? When they looked at the practical effect of such a system in Preston, they would see that it had not rendered that place independent, as the noble Baron had contended such a system would, of the influence of the great neighbouring landed proprietors: on the contrary, the Members that had hitherto sat for Preston had, generally speaking, been connected with the neighbouring influential families; and similar effects might be expected in other places similarly situated as to the state of the franchise. With regard to the objections raised to the enfranchisement of the metropolitan districts, when they came, in the course of the Bill, to that part of it, he should be prepared to show the wisdom and utility of enfranchising these districts, and he should be also, at the proper time, prepared to discuss other parts of the Bill to which reference had been made by the noble Baron. With these observations, he begged to conclude by saying that he could not, for the reasons which he had stated, agree to the proposition of the noble Baron.

Lord *Wynford* was persuaded that the Bill could not be final, that it ought not to be final. The effect of it would be, to place all power in the hands of the manufacturing, and entirely to destroy the landed interest. Of 378,000 persons at present duly qualified, the Bill would exclude above 130,000, who were engaged in agriculture. The moment the agriculturists found that this was the case, the discovery would, no doubt, be followed by a great and just clamour on their part; there would be, indeed, universal discontent, followed, he believed, by more dangerous consequences than was to be apprehended from the present clamour. The principle on which the qualification was given by the Bill, and the principle on which it was withheld, were equally absurd. Many towns would be without Representation, although possessing three times the number of persons with a 10*l.* qualification, than other towns which, according to the Bill, were to be represented. His noble and learned friend had shown, that the 10*l.* qualification would admit of but few electors, while a 20*l.* qualification would limit them to a very small number. This confirmed his opinion that the principle itself was bad. In his opinion, the test of the fitness of a town to return Members should be, not the aggregate amount of population, but the number of persons possessing a proper qualification. The principle of the Bill was population, with a slight infusion, if he might so express it, of property, and there were many towns on which the franchise was conferred by the Bill which did not possess qualified persons enough to entitle the towns to be enfranchised. He could point out several towns in schedules C and D which did not possess so great a number of qualified voters as several of the boroughs contained in schedules A and B; and which, consequently, he trusted the justice of that House would never permit to be deprived of their franchise. His noble and learned friend adverted to an observation which fell from his noble friend on that side of the House, and objected to his not providing for the Representation of those towns which might hereafter have claims. He agreed with his noble and learned friend in that observation; but that would not reconcile him to schedule D, because he could tell his noble and learned friend, that there were many towns, not which might, but which actually did, possess a number of persons qualified, according to the principle of this Bill, to return one Member, but which were excluded. There were two towns, which, according to the last returns, possessed a larger population than five or six of the towns contained in schedule D, but which were not included in that schedule. He, therefore, asked upon what principle schedule D was made out, seeing that it was not upon the principle of population or of property upon which the towns it contains were selected. He had already alluded to two towns, which, if the selection had accorded with that principle, must have been inserted in the schedule; and, if time permitted, he could adduce many instances to illustrate the injustice of the present Bill. Why, for instance, was not the right of Representation given to Margate, which possessed a population amounting to 10,000—a population much larger than that of some towns included in schedule D? But when it was considered that many of the towns included in that schedule were, for the purpose of making up the necessary amount of population, composed of various places which, in strictness, did not belong to the town itself, but were intended to be forcibly allied to it, by the operation of another bill—namely, the Boundaries Bill—was there, he would ask, a town in England which, upon such a principle, could not be made equal to any of the towns in schedule D? He affirmed, therefore, that the framers of this Bill had departed from their own principle, in many cases, in reference to schedule D. That schedule included many towns which ought not to stand in it; while, on the other hand, many towns were not in the schedule, which ought to be brought into it. Having made this statement in answer to the observation of his noble and learned friend, he would advert to another topic—namely, the Amendment of the noble Baron. In the first place, he must say, that he was not a party to that Amendment; he had received no communication upon the scheme which that Amendment embraced, and could not be expected to give his immediate assent to it. He was quite prepared to say, that schedule C ought to be altered; but the best way would be, to get rid of the schedule altogether, and to put the towns in a separate clause, so as to discuss their respective merits as they were brought forward. He did not quite agree with his noble friend (Lord Ellenborough), with respect to some of the observations he made upon the towns contained in the list which he read over. It was impossible, however, to be prepared to state his objections to some of those towns; but there was one which, he was ready to contend, ought not to have any Representatives at all; that town was, at present, in schedule D, but his noble friend proposed to give to it two Members. Upon principle, he preferred every town, which was to be represented at all, having two Members rather than one; but, with regard to this particular town, he objected to its having any Member, because, if they were to get rid of nomination boroughs on one side, let them be done away altogether. He considered all those places as nomination boroughs in which those who had the right of voting had not the means of exercising an independent choice of their Representatives. He did not mean to object to the fair influence of property; but that town was a nomination town which was entirely in the hands of one man, as was the case with Huddersfield. Whatever might be the wealth and population of that town, the Report of the Commissioners satisfied him that it was not an independent town, and, therefore, the elective franchise ought not to be extended to it. In taking the elective franchise from towns before they had forfeited it, at least it ought not to be transferred to any other place where an independent body of electors could not be constituted. Huddersfield had, undoubtedly, a very extensive population, and a very thriving trade, but, whatever might be its wealth or its population, he believed it would be found, that all the houses in the town, with the exception of one, belonged to one individual, and that he would at all times be able to influence the return of the Representatives. The Commissioners, indeed, in their Report had distinctly admitted this fact; but, under some vague kind of opinion that a place so large as Huddersfield would ultimately work out its independence, they had not recommended the extension of the boundaries of the borough so as to cure the defect. There was another borough, however (Arundel), of which the Commissioners had recommended the extension of the boundaries, but there they had included Little Hampton, in which, although the houses were held on very long leases, the holders could not transfer their interest without the consent of the noble Duke who was the proprietor of the whole. Now this, he (Lord Wynford) thought, was such a state of dependence as rendered the tenant subservient to the purposes of the proprietor, and he intended, at the proper time, to propose an amendment with reference to it. He would conclude by repeating, that he had many objections to the Clause; but he would reserve his remarks on individual instances, as he hoped that the claims of every town would be fairly considered on its separate merits.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, their Lordships were now called on to consider, according to the proposition of his noble friend (Lord Ellenborough), what boroughs were to have enfranchisement, and what boroughs were not to have enfranchisement. His noble friend proposed that the boroughs which, according to the Bill, were to be enfranchised, some being placed in schedule C, to receive two Members, and some in schedule D to receive only one, should all be placed in one schedule, and receive two Members. His noble friend proposed to do away with schedule D; but his noble friend also proposed to omit several of the boroughs which, by the Bill, were to be enfranchised; and, in order to have a better understanding of the question, he should first read the names of those places which, according to his noble friend's proposal, were now to be omitted. The first was the town of Greenwich, in Kent, the reason for omitting which might be classed under the general objection to the Metropolitan Representation; and the next was the town of Devonport, which, as Plymouth was to retain two Members, might, they apprehended, share very well with it in Representation. The four next which they proposed to omit were, Finsbury, Lambeth, Mary-le-bone, and the Tower Hamlets. Three of them would, in the event of a division of the county of Middlesex, have their interests fully represented by its Members; and he did not see any reason why the residents of Lambeth, numerous as they were, could not have the privilege of voting for the borough of Southwark. The next places which they proposed to leave out of the enfranchising schedule were Brighton and Cheltenham. He (Lord Wharncliffe) had really never seen or heard an argument why these towns were to have a preference over others in the privilege of choosing Representatives. If the franchise depended on population, he could understand it; but those who denied that, had never been able to give a satisfactory reason for what they proposed. The next places to be omitted were, Oldham, Bury, Rochdale, and Salford, in the county of Lancaster, all of which would, he considered, be sufficiently represented by their immediate neighbours. At the same time, it was proposed that Lancashire should be divided, and each division should receive two Members, in one of which Salford would be included: moreover in that were Warrington, Blackburn, and Bolton, all of which would be represented. He saw no reason why Chatham should not return Members in conjunction with Rochester and Stroud; Chatham was, therefore, to be omitted. The next place to be omitted was Dudley, which, as its trade and interests were precisely the same as Wolverhampton, would be sufficiently represented by the Members for that place. The next town was Gateshead. He (Lord Wharncliffe) had some acquaintance with both Gateshead and Newcastle; Gateshead was a mere suburb of the latter, enjoying the same trade; possessing precisely the same interests; being, in fact, a mere suburb of Newcastle—and he certainly could not see the propriety of giving it a separate Member. Then came the town of Wakefield. Every one knew that Wakefield formerly was the centre of a very extensive manufacture; but everybody also knew, that its manufacture existed no longer; and the only reason that could be given now for placing it in the enfranchising schedule was, that it had a considerable trade in corn. Walsall was in the same situation as Dudley, and they proposed to unite it also with Wolverhampton, considering its interests so sufficiently represented. Whitby, although it formerly had a considerable portion of the whale fishery, was now in such a state of decline that it had no claim to separate Representation. Having thus mentioned the places to be left out of the schedule, he must add, that by this scheme, he and his noble friend conceived, that no place in England or Wales, of any importance, and having a separate interest, would be unrepresented. He would next enumerate the places to which it was proposed to extend the franchise. The noble Lord accordingly proceeded to read those boroughs of the schedule which he proposed should remain, similar to that read by Lord Ellenborough. Among these, he observed, they undoubtedly included Huddersfield, notwithstanding the observations of the noble and learned Lord near him (Lord Wynford). He believed it would be found that, although the land on which Huddersfield stood, did belong to an individual (Sir John Ramsden), that gentleman would have very little influence in the return of the Representative. Huddersfield, too, was a place of great wealth, of increasing importance, and the seat of the manufacture of a particular species of cloth in great consumption. He could assure his noble and learned friend, that he need be under no apprehension, for Huddersfield would be perfectly independent. Having thus gone through the names of the places which they wished to insert in the schedule to have two Members each, he would say, in all sincerity, that he thought the scheme was a good one, and that there was nothing more detrimental to the interests of the represented, than the collisions which would take place if only one Member was to be given to a town. He looked upon this part of his noble friend's plan as a decided improvement on the Bill, for it was his conviction, that nothing could be more fatal to the interests of towns, than perpetual election conflicts among the inhabitants, to secure the return of one Member. Having two, each interest might find a Representative, and conflicts be avoided. He said, therefore, give to every enfranchised town two Members. With respect to the places omitted, they were all, except the metropolitan districts, omitted from the first Reform Bill; and as to them, he confessed he did not think it wise to give separate Members to a number of districts so close to the seat of the Legislature. It might be true, that the Members for these places would not turn out to be demagogues; but still he thought it was not wise to have a number of Members sitting for places in the immediate vicinity of Parliament, and liable to be called to account for any unpopular votes in the way they had seen in more than one instance on recent occasions. When a Member was once elected, he should be removed as much as possible from the exhibition of all feelings of a local description, and hold himself the Representative of all the interests of the community. There might be occasions, too, in which a Member would feel himself compelled to give a vote for the advantage of the country directly in opposition to those of his constituents, and he (Lord Wharncliffe) could not for the life of him, see the propriety of exposing a number of them to be called to account on all occasions for the votes they might give in the House of Commons. He was only anxious to have the plan of his noble friend well understood, and to satisfy their Lordships that he had no wish to defeat Reform; on the contrary, none were more anxious than he and his friends to have every interest fully represented in Parliament. They were desirous, however, of not proceeding upon the principle laid down—namely, population and the assessed taxes; because they considered these to be a very uncertain criterion. The scheme of his noble friend would, undoubtedly—including the Members proposed for the counties by the Bill, by giving two Members to twenty towns, two additional Members to Middlesex, four to Lancashire, and two to Yorkshire, one to Swansea, and three to the Welsh counties, together with the additional Members for Scotland and Ireland—absorb the whole number of the Members for the boroughs contained in schedule A. They proposed, however, to supersede the clause which gave to certain counties these Members. He never could see what advantage the agricultural interest could derive from that plan. It appeared to him that every county with three Members would be constantly involved in party contests, to the prejudice of the interests of landlords and tenants, without any counteracting benefit to any party. On the whole, he was convinced that the plan of his noble friend would secure an efficient Representation for all the interests of the country.

Lord *Seagrave* would not have troubled the House with any observations on the question, were it not for what had fallen from the noble Lord who spoke last with respect to the town of Cheltenham. That town was, he conceived, fully entitled to have a Representation, as well from its increasing wealth and population, as from the amount it paid in taxes to the State. He was convinced, indeed, that even the noble Baron who moved the Amendment (Lord Ellenborough) would give his vote in favour of the claims of Cheltenham, and the more so, as that noble Lord had lately purchased an estate in its vicinity. That noble Lord was also, he believed, an active member in getting up that club of Anti-Reformers called Conservatives; and when their Lordships heard, that the noble Baron considered Cheltenham of importance enough to be honoured with the establishment in it of a branch of the club, the noble Baron would scarcely deny to the place he had made the seat of his private legislation, the benefits of public Representation. But Cheltenham was, above all, entitled to a Representation on account of the manner in which it had distinguished itself in the late contests, and the zeal with which it had stepped forward in opposition to the claims of the brother of the noble Duke, whom he saw opposite (the Duke of Beaufort), when that noble Lord refused to pledge himself to vote for Reform. On that, and on the best of all grounds, that he believed it could not be resisted, he should vote against the omission of Cheltenham in the schedule.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* expressed himself much gratified with the vote which their Lordships had first come to on entering the Committee, whatever delay might have ensued in the progress of that Bill to which he never could give his complete assent. He was, however, prepared to redeem his pledge as to the great principle, in his mind, on any Reform Bill—the granting adequate Representation to the interests springing up anew in the altered state of society. Where, however, there was no distinct and separate interest, he should resolutely refuse to grant any right to return Members to such places as had it not at present. The clause, as it now stood, with respect to the right of voting by a 10*l.* qualification was, in his opinion, unsatisfactory, vague, and undetermined. It was injudicious and dangerous, because it was liable to be made an instrument of creating votes by master-manufacturers having the control of 200 or 300 workmen, living, all of them, as was mostly the case, upon tenements of 3*s.* a week or less; for he would, at pleasure, increase the wages and raise the rent, to bring them within the provisions of the Act, and render them competent voters at the moment he required their overwhelming influence at the election. This, he was convinced, would be one of the consequences of the clause. He objected, also, to another portion of the Bill—that which gave votes for the counties to those who already possessed votes for towns. He thought they would tend much to take away from the agricultural interests that fair proportion of power which their wealth, and influence, and importance in the State, entitled them to demand. He had always been an advocate for the extinction of the rotten boroughs, and he was glad of having an opportunity of declaring his attachment to Reform; and while he professed that attachment, while he was anxious to enfranchise the great towns, he was guilty of no inconsistency in opposing many portions of the present Bill, which he thought would be subversive of the Constitution, and which he was sure would not be a final settlement of the question; for, before many months passed over their heads, their Table would be crowded with petitions from other places for the extension of, or participation in, the right of voting. He perfectly concurred in the Amendment of the noble Baron, deeming it a far more safe plan of Reform than that proposed by the Bill. That would, he feared, be fatal to the best interests of the country; and looking at the high-minded body of men by whom he was surrounded, who would disdain all those little arts by which meaner persons attained and preserved influence, he could not be otherwise than filled with apprehensions that the day would come when the power and dignity of that august Assembly would be for ever destroyed. He prayed that his forebodings might be false, but his fears overwhelmed his hopes.

Lord *Durham* was convinced that the noble Baron who proposed the Amendment, did so for the purpose only of recording his own plans, and not that he might lead the House into a protracted discussion of the general principle of the schedule. He thought, therefore, that it would be more convenient for the House to agree to the clause generally; and afterwards to discuss the case of each town, in the order in which it stood in the schedule. At present great inconvenience would be felt by discussing, on the general question of agreeing to the clause, the merits of each town. If the Committee allowed the case of each town in the schedule to be discussed separately, and in its order, he would pledge himself to show that every one of those towns was entitled to Representation; and that the plan of the noble Lord, instead of putting an end to the agitation of those claims on the part of other towns, would, on the contrary, give rise to greater heartburnings and jealousies. The noble Baron had given three reasons, founded upon his own knowledge of the circumstances of Gateshead, to prove that place not to be entitled to Representation. But he would undertake to prove, to the satisfaction of the Committee, that the noble Baron's reasoning was incorrect. In the first place, the noble Baron stated, that Gateshead was a suburb of Newcastle. Now, he (Lord Durham) could assure the Committee, from his own knowledge, that Gateshead never was a suburb of Newcastle. In the second place, the noble Baron contended that the interests of the former place were identical with those of the latter; and, thirdly, that the trade of the two places was the same. In each of those particulars, he could assure the noble Baron, that he was altogether misinformed. He would also undertake to show, as each town came to be discussed, that the Amendment of the noble Baron would, by interfering with the schedule, injure the Bill, instead of improving it, and would give great dissatisfaction to the country, and especially as respected the metropolitan districts. As to those districts, if the framers of the Bill had erred at all, they had erred in giving them too small a number of Members.

The Earl of *Haddington* would not have trespassed on the time of the Committee that night, but for the preliminary observations of the noble Baron who had just sat down. He would leave it to the noble Baron and to the noble Lord near him (Lord Ellenborough) to fight their own battle between them. His own objections to the present Bill had been, from the first, that it allowed no hope of the final settlement of the question of Reform. Now, all that he could say in favour of the noble Baron's Amendment was, that it did hold out some hope of a final settlement. That noble Baron had asked, how could it be expected that the towns which, to the number of twenty, were entitled to be placed in the schedules C and D, would be satisfied after the disappointment of the hopes which the framers of the Bill had excited? But he would go further than the noble Baron, and he would say, that it was impossible to give any answer to the arguments which would be alleged in support of the claims of many other towns which were now excluded from the Representation, after the places in those schedules should have been enfranchised. In two petitions which had that evening been presented, they had a specimen of the sort of claims which would be hereafter made, founded upon the scheme of population and assessed taxes, for the right of having Representatives by all the towns not included in these schedules. If their Lordships adopted the Bill, he knew not what answer they could consistently give to those parties. But, by the adoption of the plan of his noble friend, the franchise would be conferred on places possessing the claims of great wealth, and great industry, and having distinct and separate interests to be represented; and by thus confining the Representation, a rule would be established to regulate future proceedings, and answer all applications from all places not so circumstanced, claiming to have Members on the ground of their population, and the amount of assessed taxes. Their Lordships would be enabled to say to them, "We have rested our measure upon principles within which you do not fall, and it is now too late to come and urge other grounds of claim upon us." By such a course, there would be some reasonable prospect of a final settlement of this question. On the contrary, by acting on the mere principles of population and taxation, there was no security against a perpetual recurrence of claims being made, even from such places as Doncaster, for the right of Representation; and no consistent refusal could be given to such applications. He wished, further, to state an objection which he entertained against a certain class of boroughs which had been put into the schedules, and two of which were retained in the Amendment proposed by the noble Baron. He meant that class of boroughs which were formed by taking in a large extent of country, several miles in length, and blending together all the places within that track, and forming them into a district borough, giving it the right of Representation. This was, in his judgment, establishing a very dangerous principle. In all the plans of Parliamentary Reform—in all the *beau ideal* schemes which the imagination of Reformers ever sketched—nothing similar to these district boroughs had been embraced. It would have been far better to have avoided that sort of district Representation. The leaving out, in the noble Baron's plan, such places as Walsall and Dudley, and one or two others, had, therefore, his most perfect approbation; and he could have wished that, in the case of Wolverhampton, which had been formed into a borough by having an immense district joined to it, the district had been considerably curtailed. There was no other means of giving Representation to boroughs more suitable than that of confining the franchise to the parties who had a peculiar and essential interest to be protected.

Earl *Darnley* assured the noble Baron opposite (Lord Ellenborough) that if the plan now proposed as an Amendment had been brought forward six months ago, he (Lord Darnley) should have been disposed to support it in preference to the present state of the Bill; but now, looking to the quarter from which the Amendment came, he was compelled to look upon it with suspicion.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that he should not press the Amendment to a division.

Clause agreed to.

Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds, were severally voted parts of the schedule belonging to the clause, without dissent.

On the question that Greenwich stand part of the schedule,

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that he objected to the insertion of Greenwich and Woolwich in that schedule, because the enfranchisement of those places, and the agricultural districts which separate them combined in one borough, made way for the operation of that principle, the evil consequences of which he had endeavoured to point out. If the principle that a given population, contained within a certain number of square miles, should entitle a place to send Members to Parliament, where in England was the district in which such a claim might not be set up? But the objections which the noble Lords opposite themselves had so often made to nomination boroughs, applied to the enfranchisement of those places, as they would constitute a nomination borough of the most mischievous tendency. The two Members would be returned by the united service—one by the Ordnance Board, and the other by the Admiralty. Woolwich was a wretched town, consisting chiefly of the houses of artificers in the employment of the Government—of small shops dependent on those artificers—and of public-houses. He thought that they might just as well give the Representation to the regiments of artillery as to that place. Again, much of Greenwich was the property of the Crown, part having been recently purchased, so that the voters there would be, for the most part, under the influence of the Crown. The same remark applied to Deptford, which was a wretched place. Most of the principal householders in all the three towns were servants of the Government, or retired officers; and surely such a constituency would render the place a nomination borough of the worst kind. On these grounds he moved that Frome should be inserted in the schedule instead of Greenwich.

The *Lord Chancellor* was surprised at the objections which the noble Baron now advanced against the enfranchisement of Greenwich; because it was, no long time ago, the noble Baron's principal objection to the present Bill, that it would create a difficulty in the obtaining of seats in Parliament for the members of the Government. But when he remembered that the noble Baron eulogized nomination as good in itself, and especially deprecated the destruction of boroughs for which members of the Administration could be nominated, he (the Lord Chancellor) could not see the congruity of the noble Baron's argument. He did not say this as agreeing with the noble Baron that nomination boroughs were such good things, but only to show, that all which the noble Baron had said of Greenwich would be, if it were true, a strong argument why the noble Baron ought not to oppose this part of the schedule. But the fact was, the footing on which the right of voting was to be put by the Bill before the Committee was such, that there was no justice in saying that Greenwich would be a nomination borough. That town, taken with the other places which were united with it in the schedule, contained a numerous population, paying 22,000*l.* in assessed taxes, and having upwards of 6,000 houses rated above 10*l.* Now, a great proportion of those houses were occupied by respectable and wealthy persons connected with the commercial interest, as was well known to every person acquainted with the neighbourhood of Greenwich. But perhaps the noble Baron's acquaintance there was confined to a few of the most convenient houses. That district was, in fact, the head quarters, he might say, of one of the most important branches of the trade of this country—he meant the shipping interest. On the grounds of population, assessed taxes, and commercial importance, that district was entitled to Representation.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* concurred in the opinion of the noble Baron, that Greenwhich would make a nomination borough of the worst description. It might be convenient to the Government to have such boroughs, but injurious to the country. He, therefore, should support the Amendment.

Amendment negatived. Greenwich inserted in the schedule; as were also Sheffield and Sunderland.

On the question that Devonport stand part of the clause,

Lord *Ellenborough* proposed, that the question respecting that town should be adjourned for discussion on another evening. The impatience manifested by the Committee rendered it impossible to carry the Bill further that evening with propriety.

Lord *Durham* thought, the Committee might conveniently go into the discussion, Lord *Wynford* would support a motion for adjournment if the noble Baron persevered in making it.

The Duke of *Newcastle* said, that the House seemed to be so little inclined to discuss the details of the Bill, and, indeed, there could be so little good expected from the discussion, that he would recommend it to the Committee to vote all the details of the Bill at once, and send it up to a third reading [*cheers.*]

Lord *Ellenborough* was sorry to hear that cheer. It showed that the House had got into a state from which it was not easy to bring it back, and in which it would be impossible to discuss the schedule fairly and temperately. If the noble Lords persevered in going through the details of the Bill in that manner, he would promise them that they should not carry their Bill these six months to come. However, what had occurred in the House in the earlier part of the night had not deprived him of the hope, that the discussion would be conducted in a proper manner.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that the Bill had been discussed, so far as noble Lords on that (the Ministerial) side of the House, were concerned, both fairly and temperately. The cheer which gave the noble Baron so much dissatisfaction, appeared to him (the Lord Chancellor) to be no other than an expression of good humour, in which several Lords near the noble Baron had joined. Surely it could not be complained of, that the noble Duke opposite had not been greeted with a serious cheer, when it was plain that he did not say seriously what had caused the cheer; that is, that he wished the Bill to be passed at once. As that was the first time that the question was introduced as to the hour at which the Committee should adjourn each night, he thought it would be convenient that the House should then decide that question at once. There was no reason why the adjournment should be fixed so early as eleven o'clock.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* wished to acquaint the noble Lords opposite, before the question of Adjournment was decided, that he was determined to take the sense of the Committee respecting the Representation of the Tower Hamlets.

Lord *Ellenborough* explained, that he proposed the Adjournment, not on account of the lateness of the hour, but on account of the impatience manifested by the Committee.

Lord *Wynford* thought, that Devonport ought to be included with Plymouth, and that two Members would then be quite sufficient for both combined. If Devonport were to have two Representatives, all places similarly circumstanced would claim a similar Representation. At the least, if Devonport were continued in that schedule, the places in schedule D would have a right that their Representation should not be diminished. For the sake of that interest (the agricultural) which, although it supported the other two interests (the commercial and manufacturing), was by this Bill sacrificed to them, he would object to Members being given to this and to many other places in those schedules. The effect of the Bill upon the whole Representation of the country would be, to give no more than 170 Members to the agricultural interest, whilst the commercial and manufacturing interests would have 330 Representatives. He begged leave to move that Devonport be omitted from the schedule. If that were carried he would move to substitute Frome for Devonport.

Lord *Morley* assured the noble and learned Baron that he underrated the importance of Devonport, and the respectability of its inhabitants.

Lord *Ellenborough* would repeat his former declaration, that it was most dangerous to establish the principle, that places were entitled to Representation on account of their possessing a large population and considerable wealth. When that principle should once have been recognized by the Legislature, every place that might hereafter increase in wealth and population would claim to be represented; so that the Bill, as it stood, instead of being a final measure, would lead to continual change. Devonport was circumstanced similarly to Greenwich, as respected the influence of the Government. There were two places in schedule B which had a greater right to two Members than Devonport; Helston and Dartmouth.

Earl *Grey* said, that Devonport was a place of great wealth and independence, and containing 44,000 inhabitants, and upwards of 6,000 houses rated at 10*l.* In respect to population and wealth, Frome was greatly inferior to that town. But he would ask the noble Lords who were acquainted with those places, what kind of Reform would that be which should give to Helston and Dartmouth the Representation which was refused to Devonport.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* said, that the importance of Devonport was sinking considerably.

Original Question agreed to, and Devonport inserted in the schedule; as was also Wolverhampton.

House resumed—Committee to sit again.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Monday, May 21, 1832.

MINUTES.] Papers ordered. On the Motion of Sir Robert Inglis, of the Number of Catholic Priests in Ireland, Convicted of celebrating Marriage between Protestants.—On the Motion of Mr. Hyde Villiers, Copies of all Letters which passed between the East-India Directors and their Supercargoes in China, of the 31st May, 1831, &c.

Bills read a second time:—Division of Counties; Boundaries (Scotland); Lunatic Commissions, and Exchequer Court Offices.

Petitions presented. By Sir Charles Cockerell, from Evesham;—by Mr. Bouverie, from New Sarum;—by Lord Althorp, from Glasgow and Dalkeith;—by Mr. Curteis, from Brighton, Burwash, and Ticehurst;—by Mr. Hodges, from twenty-six Parishes in Kent;—by Mr. Bolton King, from the Warwick Political Union;—and by Mr. Gillon, from Linlithgow and Airdrie, for stopping the Supplies.—By Admiral Adam, from Balmerino;—by an Hon. Member, from Kinross;—by Mr. Kennedy, from Roxburgh, Kilmarnock, Ayr, Dumfries, Jedburgh, and Oban;—by Sir John Wrottesley, from Wolverhampton;—by Mr. Hodgson, from Newcastle-upon-Tyne;—by Colonel Anson, from Great Yarmouth;—by an Hon. Member, from St. Martin's-in-the-Fields;—and by Sir Grey Skipwith, from Stratford-on-Avon, in favour of Reform.—By Sir Andrew Agnew, from Glasgow and Paisley, against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland.)—By Mr. Crampton, from Cootehill, and Workingham, for Abolishing the Punishment of Death for Crimes against Property.

MINISTERIAL PLAN OF EDUCATION (IRELAND).] Sir *Andrew Agnew* presented a Petition against the Ministerial Plan of Education in Ireland, from the Synod of Galloway, and signed on its behalf by John Milroy, the Moderator. The assembly from which this petition had emanated was very large, and the feeling on the subject by those who attended was nearly unanimous. The petitioners expressed the most decided objection to the principles of the plan, or of any similar plan, which excluded from the schools the use of the Bible. He entirely concurred with the prayer of the petition.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* had received a letter from a clergyman who attended the synod from whence this petition had emanated, which declared that, so far from that petition being carried unanimously, as represented by the hon. Baronet, it was only carried by the casting vote of the Moderator. Although he was anxious not to say anything likely to provoke a discussion, yet he could not allow the petition to be received without expressing his conviction, that the opinion expressed in it as to the principles of the system proposed by Government, was founded on an entire mistake, as were many of the speeches of hon. Members on the same subject. The petition stated, that, by the proposed system, only certain portions of the Scriptures would be allowed to be used. That was a mistake: for there was to be a general system, to embrace a moral, a literary, and a classical education; and in addition to that, there was to be separate religious instruction for children of the different religious persuasions: two days in the week were to be set apart for this purpose, when the Protestant instructor might put into the hands of the Protestant youths the whole of the Bible. The object was not to take the Bible out of the hands of the Protestant, but to prevent the Protestant from having anything to do with the religious instruction of the Catholic, or the Catholic with the Protestant. Only such portions of the Scriptures were allowed to be introduced into the general plan as should be approved of by the General Board, so that, under the plea of instruction, nothing should be introduced to which the clergymen of the different persuasions could object. By attending to this point, a collision of opinions and feelings would be prevented, and the good work of a joint instruction carried on. But as to the objection, that portions only of Scripture were introduced into the general instruction of youth, he was at a loss to imagine how this could be said to act prejudicially against Protestant interests, when, independent of the two days in the week set apart for the purpose of exclusive instruction, there was nothing to prevent it from being extended to the Protestant children on every day in the week, except only during the period set apart for public instruction. If he could for one moment think that this joint system of instruction would in the slightest degree interfere with Protestant children, by instilling Catholic principles into their minds, he should be one of the first to object to the measure; but his conviction was decidedly the contrary, and he thought the benevolent views of Government could not be carried into effect by any other plan; for if the Bible were allowed to be introduced generally among the children of the schools, compelling those of the Catholics to join with the rest, it would act indirectly on these as a system of exclusion, while the object of the Ministerial plan was, to bring the Protestant and Catholic children together, in order that both might partake of its benefits. He was convinced that, so far from violating the religious feelings of the Protestants of Ireland, it would have a directly contrary tendency. He was as fully persuaded as any hon. Member of the great blessings which had been bestowed on Scotland, since the Reformation, by all classes studying the Scriptures; but there was a great difference between the religion and habits of the people of that country and those of Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* deprecated every attempt to interfere with the religious education of Catholic children. Let Protestants educate their own children as they chose, and all that Catholics asked was, to be allowed the same privilege. The grossest oppression had been practised in compelling Catholic parents, under the penalty of starvation, to send their children to the Kildare-street schools, and against this system he had loudly protested. In the new system the Bible was not used as a class-book for four days in the week, and this was the only restriction imposed, as on Fridays and Saturdays Protestant children were to have the Scriptures, and if they did not then read them it would be the fault of the Protestant instructors. A great deal of cant and hypocrisy had been bestowed on this subject out of that House, one half of which must be attributed to the plans originating with a reforming Ministry, a similar plan having been previously approved of, even by many of the clergy of the Established Church. Some persons rejoiced that the poor Irish peasant was exposed to the risk of excommunication; but he pitied the man who could rejoice at the idea of these miserable beings having only a choice of evils, either quarrelling with their priests, or suffering starvation by quarrelling with their landlords. He was extremely sorry to see the intelligent people of Scotland led astray upon this subject. They had a right to establish a system of education suitable to their own religious opinions; but that system was not necessarily suitable for Ireland. Indeed, it was very unsuitable, and the Scotch had no right to force a system upon Ireland at variance with their religion and habits. The Irish might be wrong, but they sincerely believed that it was not advisable to allow children the unrestricted use of the Bible. They thought it introduced a familiarity inconsistent with the respect due to the sacred volume. Such were their opinions, and, whether they were correct or incorrect, they had a right to be consulted in the education of their children, and he would put it to the hon. Members for Scotland, whether they would allow the clergy of another creed to interfere with their clergymen, and prevent them teaching the children of Scotland according to their own creed and method.

Colonel *Lindsay* thought the hon. and learned member for Kerry ought not to have introduced topics into his speech which, from their irritating nature, must necessarily beget angry discussion. He assured the hon. and learned Member, that party feeling was not the source of the opposition which prevailed in Scotland to the Ministerial plan of education for Ireland. The hon. and learned member for Kirkcudbright was wrong in charging the parties who had forwarded these petitions with ignorance. The subject had been discussed in several Synods, and they had not come to a hasty or rash conclusion on the question. They had directed their attention particularly to the point alluded to by the hon. and learned member for Kirkcudbright, and, in their opinion, the Scriptures were improperly excluded. It was said, that Protestant children would have the unlimited use of the Bible on certain days, for which a provision was made; but, then, the teachers might be Protestants, or they might be Catholics, and against this no sufficient provision was made. The fundamental principle of Protestantism was, that all the Scriptures should be read, and, therefore, the Synods were right in their prayer that the Scriptures should not be given to the children of these schools in a mutilated form. He would appeal to the hon. Members from Scotland, whether it had not been understood to have been the invariable practice, since the time of the Reformation, to educate the children of that country from their infancy by reading in the Holy Scriptures, and whether, if there were anything superior in the intellectual condition of the Scotch, it was not to be attributed to the keeping up this system of instruction — that of training up their children, from their earliest years, in the reading of the Scriptures; and seeing the good effects which had followed that system, it was not to be wondered at that they had such an attachment to it, and expressed themselves in their petitions so strongly in its favour.

Mr. *James Johnstone* must deny, that the principles of the plan, as the hon. and learned member for Kirkcudbright had said, were mistaken in Scotland. His countrymen had had an opportunity of examining the measure, and had arrived at the conclusion, that it was calculated to injure the interests of Protestant children in Ireland. The parties who had forwarded these petitions had not been in the slightest degree influenced by political motives; and the hon. and learned member for Kerry had been equally mistaken when he said, that the intelligence of the Scotch people had been led astray on this subject; their reputation for intelligence stood on too high ground to be affected by such observations. The hon. and learned Member had asked, if the Irish were to interfere with the system of the education of the Scotch, how would it be liked? Such interference in Scotland would make very little progress. It was from feeling the benefits of their system that the Scotch were so anxious to extend it to others; and he should be sorry that, knowing its good effects, any of his countrymen should be found opposing these petitions. They considered it the duty of a Protestant Government to support a system which would not interfere with the fundamental principle on which Protestantism was founded—the reading, unmutilated, the Holy Scriptures. This was a most important petition, and would, he trusted, be received by the House with that respect which was due to the reverend body from whence it emanated.

Sir *Robert Bateson* said, the hon. member for Kirkcudbright had commenced his observations by saying, that those who opposed this measure were all in the dark as to the main principle of the measure introduced by Government. Did that hon. Member mean to say, that the Synod of Ulster, and other parts of Ireland, were such a set of blockheads that they did not understand the nature of the system proposed by Government, and that they were so ignorant as to render it necessary that they should be enlightened by the superior wisdom of that hon. Member? He must tell that hon. Member that, notwithstanding his explanation, he had thrown no new light on a subject so well understood. The hon. and learned member for Kerry had also said, that the opposition which had been raised against this Government measure was founded in cant and hypocrisy, and a political feeling. He would take it upon himself, however, to deny positively and most indignantly that such motives had, in the slightest degree, influenced the opponents of the measure. He was waiting for an opportunity of presenting a similar petition, which was signed by many Whigs, as well as Tories. The opinions of these petitioners were founded in truth; and, therefore, the opposition to the measure would daily increase in strength, and would never rest until it succeeded. The system of the Kildare-street Society was one in which all religious persuasions were brought together without interference on the score of religion—it was working well; but was now to be extinguished by an exclusive system. With respect to Irish landlords interfering with their tenantry in the way described by the hon. and learned member for Kerry, he threw that imputation back with all the scorn it so well deserved; and he defied the hon. and learned Member to produce a single case in support of his imputation. It appeared to be the fashion of the present day to excite mob-hostility against the gentry of the country. It was a system which had been acted on out of doors, and appeared, on the present occasion, to be acted on within doors: he deprecated these observations, which tended to dissever the ties of society. The landlords in the north of Ireland were well disposed and charitable, and had the interests of their tenantry at heart quite a much as the hon. and learned member for Kerry, or any of those who supported his opinions.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* asserted most confidently, that this subject had been taken up by the clergy of Scotland with the purest spirit and feeling as to the measure itself. No men in this kingdom were actuated less by political feelings on all occasions than they; and his hon. friend, the member for Kirkcudbright, must, he was sure, be misled. The sentiments of the clergy of Scotland were felt and expressed on these simple grounds; that they, from the sanctity of their office, and being appointed to superintend education in Scotland, had felt it their duty to come forward on this occasion, because they considered the principles introduced by Government, in the proposed system of education for Ireland, in decided opposition to the principles they, as Protestants, thought it essential to support. It was, therefore, wrong to attribute the opposition of the Scotch clergy to political feelings.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* assured the hon. Member, that he had not charged the clergy of Scotland with doing anything on the grounds of hypocrisy and cant, as attributed to them in the observations made by the hon. member for Kerry; nor had he presumed to say, that he had thrown a new light upon the subject. He had simply said, that the question was not properly understood, and that persons were wrong who said, that only a portion of the Scriptures was allowed to be read. He believed that the opposition of the Scottish clergy arose from sincere piety, and it was not his intention to cast any reflection on that reverend body, for whom he entertained as sincere a respect as the hon. Baronet.

Mr. *Shaw* should not have risen but for the hon. member for Kirkcudbright, who had a second time made the same erroneous statement with reference to the real objections to the proposed plan of education. Because he himself had misconceived the grounds of opposition to it, he imagined that those who opposed the system laboured under misconception. No person could be so absurd as to suppose that the Government meant to deprive Protestant children of the power of reading the Bible out of the schools, although they might be indifferent to the subject; but what the opponents of the measure protested against was, that the Bible, in its simple and entire form, was excluded from the schools properly so called, that was to say, when the children were assembled in them for the purposes of national education; and that extracts made by this new motley Board, were to be substituted for the whole Bible. The hon. member for Kerry was mistaken in saying that the heads of the Established Church had agreed to such a plan as this. They did not object, nor did he, to extracts from Scripture, properly made use of; but they never countenanced the idea of their superseding the use of the whole Scripture; and, so far from the former system having led to discord, and failed, as stated by the hon. Member opposite, he verily believed, that it was because it proceeded so harmoniously and successfully, that the Government raised an antagonist system to it, at the dictation of that irresponsible power which had for some time governed the Government of Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell:* I am much pleased that the hon. member for Dublin has at last admitted, that the Protestants of Ireland are not excluded from the use of the Scriptures, as has been repeatedly asserted by the opponents of the present system. But the sole objection of the hon. Gentleman appears to be, that the Catholic children are not obliged to submit to a system which is not sanctioned by the teachers of their religion. Why, this is the same old species of domination which has been so long exercised over the people of Ireland by the faction to which he belongs —a power which God or nature never intended they should possess, and which they never shall exercise again in Ireland. The hon. member for Londonderry, in the course of his violent harangue, thought proper to indulge in animadversions upon me of a very unwarrantable character. The hon. Gentleman is perfectly welcome to abuse me; his censure is much more pleasing to me than his praise, because I should at once begin to suspect the integrity of my own conduct, if I should, by any chance, have the misfortune to be encumbered with the hon. Member's commendations. The hon. Member has talked of the synod of Ulster, and he asked, are they to be considered as a parcel of blockheads, incapable of forming an opinion upon the subject of Irish education. I will tell the hon. member for Londonderry, that the Catholic clergy of Ireland are just as capable of forming an opinion upon what system of education is best suited to their own flocks as the synod of Ulster can possibly be; and, notwithstanding the assertion which has been made, I again deny the right of those gentlemen to dictate any system of education which is opposed to the feelings and the consciences of the people. But the fact is, a large body of the Presbyterians of the north of Ireland are favourable to the Government plan of education. In proof of this, it is only necessary for me to refer to the petition recently presented to this House, in favour of the Government plan of education, from the seceding synod of Ulster; a most respectable, moral, and intelligent class of Christians; and surely the opinions of this society are entitled to respect and consideration? The hon. Gentleman has thought proper to state that I have charged the landlords of the north of Ireland with arbitrary and oppressive conduct. I have made no such charge against the landlords of Ireland as a body. But there are instances of individual landlords who have been guilty of grievous oppression, and I am ready to prove what I assert. The case of Mr. Synge alone, is quite enough to justify all I have said. That gentleman turned out eleven families to starve in one day, because the parents refused to send their children to his schools; and it has been stated by my hon. friend, the member for Clare, in this House, that Mr. Synge's conduct was the origin of the disturbance which has taken place in that county. One important fact has, however, been elicited in the course of this discussion, which is to be found in the speech of the hon. member for Dublin, namely, that the new system of education does not exclude the Protestants of Ireland from the reading of the Scriptures. The hon. Member distinctly admitted, that the Protestant children have two days in each week allotted them for the reading of the Scriptures, whole and unmutilated. This is a fact which cannot be denied. The Protestant children have two days in the week for the perusal of the entire Scriptures, and selected portions are read every other day in the school; but, notwithstanding all this, it has been stated in petitions to this House, over and over again, and repeated by hon. Members, that by the plan of education brought forward by his Majesty's Ministers, the Protestant children are excluded from scriptural education. I must again repeat, what I have often before stated, that never was there a subject in which so much cant and hypocrisy were mixed up, as in the very question which forms the subject of this evening's discussion.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* felt, that he should not be acting as an honest man, or doing his duty towards an absent and a calumniated friend, if he did not state to the House some facts, in answer to the aspersions which the hon. and learned Member had cast upon Mr. Synge. The hon. and learned Member said, that the conduct of Mr. Synge was the cause of the disturbances in Clare. He had lately had occasion to contradict the same assertion. He did not wish to deal in recrimination, or he could easily state who was the original cause of the disturbances in Clare. Mr. Synge, a most respectable individual, possessing considerable landed property, felt it his duty, as a Protestant, to promote the education of the children on his estate. The parents were most anxious that their children should attend his schools, but the Roman Catholic priesthood denounced those schools, and compelled the people to withdraw their offspring from those places of instruction. It was perfectly true, that Mr. Synge ejected some families for not sending their children to school; but, so far from turning them out to beggary, he provided for them, and rendered their situation more comfortable than it was before. This humane individual was fired at, and several balls lodged in his body. The cause of this murderous attack was the atrocious conduct of a stipendiary priest, who stood up in his chapel, and denounced Mr. Synge as a kidnapper for the devil. This was sufficient to point him out as an object upon which the assassin's weapon was to be employed. The influence of the priesthood was at that moment directing the assassin's knife, and sending hundreds of persons to a premature grave.

Petition to be printed.

HIS MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.] Lord *Robert Grosvenor* appeared at the Bar with his Majesty's Answer to the Address of the House of Commons. The noble Lord then read the King's Answer, as follows:—

"The state of public affairs since the 10th of May, will satisfactorily account to the House of Commons for any delay in returning my Answer to the Address of this House. I trust that the object of that Address will appear to my faithful Commons to be accomplished, since the necessity of any change in my Councils has been avoided.

"WILLIAM R."

CONDUCT OF THE PRESS.] The Lord Advocate moved the Order of the Day for the second reading of the Reform of Parliament (Scotland) Bill.

Lord *Stormont* said, that he would avail himself of that opportunity, pursuant to the notice which he gave on Friday last, to call the attention of the Attorney General to the state of the Public Press at the present moment. It was true, it might be said, that the proper authorities were vested with ample powers to preserve the peace and good order of society; but that appeared to him to be no reason why he should not bring under the consideration of the House, the scandalous, licentious, and treasonable articles, which day after day issued from the Press, with the view of inducing the Attorney General to institute prosecutions against the publishers of those articles. Some of the articles which had appeared in the public prints were of such a description that he should not be discharging his duty properly if he gave them that extended publicity which would be the consequence of his reading them in that House. Indeed, they were of so obscene and scandalous a nature, that he should be doing no service to the cause which he was then advocating if he read them publicly. He would select one article as a sample, by no means the worst, of the publications with which the Press teemed. The article was to be found in the "*Satirist*," weekly paper, of Sunday, May 13th, and was headed "the King and Queen are where they please, and how they please. Who cares?" After some prefatory remarks the article proceeded as follows:—'What the devil is 'the House of Brunswick to us, ab'stractedly regarded? Nothing more than 'that of the poorest sausage-spinner in 'Germany. The people of England, wish'ful to avoid the ceaseless squabbles of 'ambitious nobles, chose a foreign family, 'about the most ancient in Europe, to fill 'the proudest station in the world, *i. e.* 'the Sovereignty over a free and victorious 'nation. That family were especially dis'tinguished by the negative sort of cha'racter which is, perhaps, the best in a 'limited monarch. From the first George 'to the first William of the family, not a 'man among them has evinced the slight'est personal claim to consideration on 'the score of mental power or moral energy. 'Of mulish, dogged obstinacy, they have 'given abundant proof. And what better 'mark could have been shown of the all'enduring loyalty of the British people, 'than the alacrity with which they were 'willing to forget the Georgian æra, from 'the reign of the first fool of the name to 'that of the fat compound of all mean 'ingredients, inclusively, when, in the pre'sent King, they beheld a man willing to 'sympathize with his subjects and to re'dress their wrongs? But now—now that 'the mask has been laid aside, their indig'nant rage succeeds to a long-suffering, 'long-trusting loyalty. The principles 'that placed the family on the Throne— 'that so-much-hacknied phrase, the prin'ciples of liberty—have found a fatal oppo'nent in the person of William 4th. So 'be it: in the people those principles have 'supporters, advocates, champions, whom 'Kings cannot enchain, nor military Dukes 'destroy. Wellington may smile at this. 'Let him try. For our parts, we publicly, 'solemnly, strenuously implore our coun'trymen to bear in mind the great consti'tutional truth, that the same power by 'which our fathers were enabled to confer 'on the family of Brunswick the Crown of 'England, when the so conferring it was 'favourable to the freedom and happiness 'of the British people, that same power 'would be justifiably and patriotically ex'ercised by us in removing the Crown 'from the head of any member of that 'family who should forget the principles 'which had called his ancestors to the 'Throne. Yes; should it unhappily be'come a question whether England should 'be free—that is to say, whether the rot'ten boroughs should be abolished and the 'great towns enfranchised—in other words, 'whether Earl Grey's Bill should pass, or 'King William 4th take his chop at Holy'rood with Charles Dix—we say, let 'England be free, and let there be two 'X's in the alphabet of monarchical im'becility.' The publication went on to say, 'A word to the Queen. This illus'trious lady, "second personage in the 'realm," "Royal Consort," and all that 'fine fudge, is nothing more than a mar'vellously ill-favoured German woman, 'who, never having been guilty of an 'idea, most gladly grasped at the delusion 'that she had one, when Whiskerandos 'Cumberland filled her frivolous head 'with his own deep cogitations on the 'subject of Reform.' In another part of the same paper this passage occurred:— 'Of the persons here alluded to, some are 'Germans—low, artful, nursed in des'potism, and devoted to it—connected 'and in daily correspondence with des'potic Princes and Ministers, following 'their guidance and constituting their 'tools—employing the resources of Eng'land, profusely bestowed upon them, even 'by the Whigs, to crush her people, and 'bribing the venal, who are every where 'to be found, to support them in their 'base ingratitude and daring machinations 'against a people who have redeemed them 'from beggary. The Queen and the 'Duchess of Kent are among the most ac'tive of these intriguers.' Again the writer proceeded—'Meanwhile, the en'emies of the nation—the Queen, the 'Duchess of Kent, the Duke of Cumber'land, and Mrs. Jordan's son—obtained 'an opposite promise, and kept incessant 'watch over his conduct. This was the 'reason why the Anti-reforming Peers 'were latterly so bold, and the Ministry 'so full of timidity and embarrassment. 'But the age is gone by when intrigues 'like these can be conducted with impu'nity. The persuaders of the King in this 'matter are the enemies both of the King 'and of the nation; and history records 'none who better deserves the doom at'tached to such conduct. The well'earned fate of another German Queen 'should have been before their eyes, or, 'at least, the more recent one of the 'Duchess of Berri.' It appeared to him impossible that such publications as these should be allowed to continue. It was quite clear that they were put forth for the purpose of bringing the King and Queen into contempt, and he felt that he should not discharge his duty as a loyal subject, if he did not take this opportunity of protesting against such scandalous libels being suffered to remain unpunished. He thought it became him publicly to call upon the Attorney General to give some explanation as to the course which he might think fit to pursue upon the subject. He understood the hon. Under Secretary of State for the Home Department to have argued, that it was best to leave such publications to the indignation and contempt of the virtuous classes of society. To the hon. Under Secretary, who was an honest man, of upright mind, the contempt of the virtuous portion of the community would doubtless be a great punishment; but he would ask, whether the persons who could sit down to write articles of such a description as that which he had read to the House, were likely to possess feelings which could be operated upon by the moral power of public opinion. He believed that they possessed feelings of such a gross nature as would be sensible only to physical punishment. They were the pests of society, and ought not to be allowed to continue. He would take an opportunity of calling the attention of the Attorney General in private to some other publications, which, as he had before stated, were of such an atrocious nature, that he could not venture to read them publicly. He had, he thought, done enough to afford the Attorney General an opportunity of declaring what his intentions were with respect to the present licentious state of the Press.

The *Attorney General* thanked the noble Lord for the courtesy he had shown him, in giving notice of his intention to put the question, as it had afforded him an opportunity of considering whether any answer could with propriety be made to it. On a former occasion the noble Lord had privately drawn his attention to other disgraceful publications, and he had then mentioned the delicacy and difficulty of his situation, anxious as he was to preserve due respect to the laws, and at the same time not to infringe upon the rights of the public. In general appreciation it was thought that the Attorney General had a power, which he did not in fact possess: it was really taken for granted, that he was a sort of officer going about with an extinguisher, at once to put out all objectionable publications—that he had nothing to do but to issue his fiat, and the publication was at an end; but, he had in truth, no peculiar authority. He did not deny that he had a peculiar duty, but he could only issue *ex officio* informations, which must afterwards be tried by a Jury, and subjected to the usual uncertainty of such proceedings. The noble Lord had himself drawn into a fuller and broader light a publication, of which few, perhaps, had heard, and it was his (the Attorney General's) firm opinion, founded upon experience, that a libeller thirsted for nothing more than the valuable advertisement of a public trial in a Court of Justice. Triumph there made him rich, and defeat gave him all the honours of martyrdom. Even martyrdom was found to have its pecuniary advantages also, while it procured the wretched author a much better lodging in a prison than, while at large, he had ever been accustomed to occupy. Punishment was, therefore, ineffectual, and he entirely agreed with the Under Secretary of State, that the contempt of well-regulated minds was generally the best treatment for libellers, however, revolting or disgusting their productions. He did not entirely agree with the noble Lord that the writers of such libels would not feel that contempt; they would feel it at least in pocket, for the public would soon turn with loathing from the pernicious pandarism of the press. He hoped, too, that the multitude of such publications would check their circulation, and as the poison would become anything but a rarity, people would cease to value and regard it. The very neglect with which they had been treated by the public authorities for a long course of months had of itself diminished the number of licentious publications, and many had fallen, which, by means of prosecution, would have been elevated to importance. In reference to the question of non-prosecution, it was impossible for him not to advert to the conduct of his predecessors in office—not to cast blame upon them, or to relieve himself, but merely to show that they set the example which he had only followed, leaving obscure publications, however offensive, to perish in their obscurity. Even his learned friend opposite (Sir C. Wetherell) had not departed from the forbearance of those who went before him, and he had refrained from prosecuting the most offensive publications in the most trying times. Such had been the course adopted in 1819, when certain publications did not stop at invective obloquy, but even recommended assassination, and openly called upon their readers to sow the streets of London with forged Bank notes. These were allowed to pass without prosecution, and for the plainest of all possible reasons—that to prosecute would have been to play the game of the libellers. The noble Lord admitted, that some of the productions of which he complained were so scandalous and obscene, that he could not do more than advert to them. If so, why should they be exposed in an open court of Justice? It was undoubtedly and lamentably true, if the evil of libels were the reading of them, that prosecutions made innumerable readers, and in cases of private libel, a proceeding before a Jury often served chiefly to disseminate the slander. He might, perhaps, be allowed to advert to a remarkable occurrence which had happened to himself. On the evening of the day when he first sat as Common Serjeant of London, a trial for a libel of a most atrocious description was brought before him, without preparation: it was contained in a paper called *The Republican*, which had gone on for some years unprosecuted by Sir J. Copley, the then Attorney General. The libel was a *resumé*, or summing-up, of all the most offensive parts of the work, and the indictment contained eleven counts, six for blasphemous libels on the Bible, and the rest for sedition, exciting the people to tumult and insurrection. The prosecution was not instituted by the Attorney General, but by the "Constitutional Association," as it was called, which took the matter out of his hands. The libels were established (indeed they could not be doubted), and the defence made by the accused rather aggravated his crime, if such a crime could be aggravated by anything said by the party on trial. After this defence, it could not be put, even as a doubt, to the Jury whether the prisoner was acquainted with the nature and effect of the publication, and as he was indicted without a name, in order to avoid difficulties as to identity, he (the Attorney General) was called upon to pass sentence upon him immediately. Two Aldermen were on the bench with him, one of whom thought that two years' imprisonment should be inflicted, while the other was only for half that term. The middle course was taken, and the offender was sentenced to a year and a half's imprisonment for a very complicated and multitudinous libel. He had been much censured as a severe Judge on this occasion; a petition had been presented to the House in behalf of the prisoner, which he had refused to sign, on the ground that his trial was most fair and impartial; but he (the Attorney General) was not aware that the public had been much benefitted by any part of the proceeding. For himself he could say, that he was much happier the moment the eighteen months had expired. As long as a writer honestly expressed his opinions, and his opinions only—as long as it was possible to give him credit for sincerity—he (the Attorney General) was greatly disinclined to prosecute. The case was widely different when a writer's object was to incite to crime, and in the instance to which he alluded, the defendant was only twenty-one years old, and, perhaps, had no improper motive. When, therefore, the term of imprisonment expired, it was a great comfort and gratification to him (the Attorney General). Why did he say this? Because, the liberty of the Press being established in this country, men were invited to publish their honest opinions, and there ought to be no torturer behind, who might prosecute them, and throw them into a dungeon for an undefined offence. The very existence of the liberty of the Press ought to make Attorneys General cautious how they proceeded to extremities. The only question, undoubtedly, which a public officer ought to ask himself was, what was his duty, and how could he best execute it? he (the Attorney General) was not disposed to shrink from it; but this he must say, that from the year 1822 to the year 1829, there was almost a total cessation of prosecutions for libels; not because they were not rife and aggravated, but because it was thought wiser policy to let them alone. What had happened in 1829 was very remarkable. His hon. and learned friend (Sir J. Scarlett) was then Attorney General, and a most gross and scandalous libel was printed, not in an obscure publication, like *The Satirist,* hunted out of some corner, but in a well-known newspaper, *The Morning Journal,* supported by a considerable capital, and by great names; that libel was directed against his present Majesty, then Duke of Clarence, and it boldly asserted, that by his vote on the Roman Catholic Question he had forfeited his right to the Throne, and never could recover his title to it. Yet for this publication no prosecution had been instituted; and when the Editor of *The Morning Journal* was afterwards proceeded against, the Jury wished that he should not be brought up for judgment, and even that he had not been prosecuted, on account of the excitement prevailing in the public mind. He begged also to state, that in that year a noble and learned Lord, who was reported to have spoken lately in another place, was not only then a member, but a leading member of the Government; yet the libel on the Duke of Clarence was passed by unnoticed. On this point he did not mean to blame the Ministers and law officers of that day, but merely to remark, with the example before him, that it would have been quite as wise if the Lord Chancellor of that day had exhibited equal forbearance in his own case, and had not indicted the Editor of *The Morning Journal,* in the Court of King's Bench, for a paragraph which stated that he had accepted a bribe of 30,000*l.* for making the hon. member for St. Mawes, Solicitor General. That was so improbable a calumny that no Lord Chancellor since the Revolution, but the noble and learned Lord, would have thought it necessary to prosecute it. The case of *The Morning Journal* was carried into court, and the prosecution begun by the Lord Chancellor in his individual capacity, though, subsequently, the Attorney General, for some hitherto unexplained reason, thought proper to proceed against the defendant by an *ex officio* information. Thus it seemed that the *ex officio* power of the Attorney General had been allowed for a long time to sleep, and had it not been awakened for the purpose of proceeding against *The Morning Journal,* that paper would have expired much sooner in the contempt and derision of all parties. In fact, it owed 800*l.* for stamps, and as the process for that sum was sent in on the eve of the trial, a degree of sympathy was excited, and subscriptions from Dukes and Peers were poured in from all quarters, which supported it much longer than it would otherwise have existed. For these reasons he was averse to proceedings of the kind, and had only prosecuted *ex officio* cases which incited to crime, and aimed at the disturbance of the public peace. Even to this extent he had met with little encouragement from Juries, for it was impossible to tell whether even a single individual amongst them, by his obstinacy, might not defeat the ends of justice. In the cases of Carlile and Cobbett the Government had prosecuted, and he had very recently met with Carlile's statement to him, which, if the House had any curiosity on the subject, he would read to them. In the case of Cobbett, Government was defeated, and the Jury discharged, owing to the perseverance of one juryman; and it was impossible for the prosecutor to dig into the heart of society on every occasion, in order to ascertain what were the political sentiments of those who were called upon to try the accused. Such was his (the Attorney General's) answer to the noble Lord's question; and if he thought proper to submit any papers to his private consideration, he would promise to give them his best consideration. Allusion had been made to slanderous attacks upon females of the highest rank. Nothing could be more disgusting; but it seemed to him that it would be taking a great liberty if he proceeded without special instructions. By a trial in a Court of Justice they might sometimes be placed in a worse situation, for which they certainly would have no reason to thank him. In the present excitement of the public mind, no doubt many improper productions had issued from the Press, but he hoped that the final settlement of the great Question would now render their recurrence improbable. He was happy that the censure upon his conduct for not proceeding against newspapers was impartial; at least, it came from all quarters; and, certainly, if he selected any one for prosecution it would be *The Times* of Friday last. That paper had utterly falsified what had occurred in another place, and had put forward, as the report of a speech, what could be nothing but a base and malicious invention of some abominable libeller. This writer actually had the impudence to say, that a noble and learned Lord, a criminal Judge, had not only advised the prosecution of an article which appeared in a previous number of *The Times*, but said that he would not form part of an Administration which would allow that paper to go without being prosecuted. This language was put into the mouth of an individual who held the highest legal office in the State in 1829, when the audacious attacks were made upon his present Majesty, to which he had recently alluded, without calling for any interference on the part of the Government. That noble and learned Judge, who might be called upon at the Old Bailey to preside at the trial, was represented in the newspaper as having himself prejudged the question in the most positive terms; and, after pronouncing, that certain articles were a notorious libel, the noble and learned Lord was said to have called upon the Attorney General to prosecute; nay, to such an extreme of infamy had this abominable Reporter gone, that he had represented the noble and learned Judge as accusing the Attorney General of misprision of treason for not commencing a prosecution. Suppose the Attorney General were to prosecute, and that noble and learned Judge were to preside, what chance could the unfortunate accused have, in such a case, of acquittal? The case, too, might be brought before the House of Peers under writ of error, and then it would be the peculiar province of that noble and learned Judge to advise their Lordships. To assign such a speech to such a person was, therefore, a libel of the most gross and injurious character; and that it was so was evident from another circumstance, that the speaker was made to go out of his way to attack the Attorney General; for what had it to do with the subject of the debate, and the attendance of the noble Lord upon the King at Windsor? The whole was a foul and atrocious libel, for which he would undertake to prosecute the paper, as soon as the noble and learned Lord denied upon oath that there was any truth in the representation. He (the Attorney General) was the less willing to believe that anything of the kind could have fallen from the noble and learned Lord, because they had formerly been upon terms of intimacy: he owed great obligations to the noble and learned Lord, who was something his senior when first he began to enter into the conversation of men. By his excellent judgment and sagacious mind that noble and learned Lord had confirmed him (the Attorney General) in his attachment to liberal opinions, which he, for one, would never desert nor betray. He did not here speak of notions confided to him as a friend, but of declarations boastfully and ambitiously brought forward by the noble and learned Lord, many years ago, according to which he was to take and keep his place in society. "I am (said the noble and learned Lord) a disciple and admirer of Sir Samuel Romilly; I hate and despise bigotry, and, therefore, I maintain the justice of Catholic claims; and I think Reform in the Representation of the people essential to the preservation of the peace of society and the welfare of the State."

Sir *Charles Wetherell* thanked the noble Lord who had introduced the subject, for calling the attention of the House to it. He must also praise the noble Lord for the manner in which he had introduced it, and must express his concurrence in the opinion, that an Attorney General and a libel might co-exist, although that was not formerly the general notion. He agreed that every libel ought not to be prosecuted; but he did not on that account hold, with the Attorney General, that he was at once to be driven from the field by writers of every description in pamphlets, newspapers, and emphemeral publications. The question adverted to the general state of the Press, a matter very fit for the attention of the Attorney General, and it had particular reference to the personal attacks upon the Queen. The Attorney General answered, that he had not prosecuted, because he had had no particular instructions; but what, then, had become of her Majesty's Attorney General and Solicitor General? Had the hon. member for Middlesex, or some other economist, abolished the places of those officers, that he did not see either of them present on an occasion like this, when such infamous, unmanly, un-gentlemanlike, un-Englishmanlike libels were under discussion? [*Mr. J. Williams made himself obvious to the Hon. Member.*] He was happy to see, that one of them, at least, was in his place, and he might, in his presence, express his doubt whether, under such circumstances, it was either the duty or the practice of the law-officers of the Crown to wait for express instructions. The Attorney General had entered into a long, and he must call it a delusive, statement, into which he had introduced a sort of episode about himself, which might be very pleasant, although he could not congratulate the hon. and learned Gentleman on its logical connexion with the subject of discussion. The upshot of his speech was, that the Attorney General was in no case to prosecute, and he had attempted to strengthen his argument by reference to certain libels upon his Majesty when Duke of Clarence, which he (Sir Charles Wetherell), as was asserted, ought to have prosecuted. He doubted, however, whether he was in office at the time; and, at all events, at that date his hands were tied, and his teeth drawn. Who was it that called on the Attorney General to restrain the Press? Who was it that called on him to restrain the freedom of debate? No one that they had heard yet. The Attorney General said, that freedom of opinion ought not to be extinguished. He agreed with the Attorney General in that respect; but they ought to see whether there were not some who, acting on their own views of freedom of opinion, exercised the greatest tyranny towards others. The Attorney General said, that there had been a great degree of excitement on the subject of the Reform Bill; that was true. The excitement had been greater than, perhaps, was ever known on any question, and a large allowance must be made for that excitement; but, then, though he did not call on the Attorney General to look into every book and every sheet that was published, with a view to search out libels, yet, when the Attorney General asked, whether it was his duty to extinguish the Press, he (Sir Charles Wetherell) had a right to retaliate the proposition, and to say, that no man who filled the office of the hon. and learned Gentleman ought to suffer the House of Brunswick to be libelled as it had been. The hon. and learned Gentleman's arguments, if they were worth anything, came to this, that no *ex officio* information ever ought to be filed; for, if prosecutions were to cease because libels were too numerous to be encountered, then the very number and the very atrocity of the libels became the ground of their indemnity. No one would pretend to deny, that, in modern times, these cases of libellous publications were most gross and crying evils; yet the hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to fancy, that he had worked his salvation as Attorney General by having brought the authors of two libels into a Court of Justice. These two prosecutions were in the cases of Cobbett and Carlile, for recommending the burning of hay-stacks; and the Attorney General supposed that, because he had prosecuted these two cases, notwithstanding that the Crown was libelled, that the Queen was libelled, that the whole of the Royal Family were libelled, that both the Houses of Legislature were libelled—notwithstanding all this, the hon. and learned Gentleman thought he had done sufficient to work out his salvation as Attorney General. But the hon. and learned Gentleman was wrong in that respect; for, though recommending people to set barns on fire was a grievous offence, yet, in the preservation of the Monarchy—in the preservation of the monarch and of the family of the Monarch, and of the personal respect due to the Monarch and his family—the considerations were fully as important—fully as important as whether, under particular circumstances, a man had or had not burnt a barn or a haystack. But the learned Attorney General did not go by that rule; he put the British monarchy in one scale, and these recommendations to burn stacks of hay and straw in the other; and, though he must say, that the British monarchy was of more value than the haystacks, yet the hon. and learned Gentleman, the Attorney General, did not seem at all to entertain that opinion. "No," said his Majesty's Attorney General, "I care little for that; as long as I can get hold of men who have recommended others to burn three loads of sainfoin." That was the judgment of the Attorney General. But then, said the Attorney General, it was not usual nor proper for this House to call the attention of the law-officers of the Crown to cases of libel. Generally that was true; but there were cases in which that House had done so, where the Attorney General had appeared to allow them to pass too much unnoticed. The hon. and learned Attorney General, however, was not content with making these grounds of defence for himself, but he must needs lug, head, neck, and shoulders into this debate a noble and learned Lord who had had nothing to do with it. What had that noble and learned Lord done to call for this treatment at the hands of the Attorney General? Why was he thus treated? Why, but because he had been called on by his Majesty, in his character as a Privy Councillor, to do that which he was bound to do—yes, bound to do—bound on oath to do it—for every Privy Councillor took an oath to advise his Majesty to the best of his power, whenever he should be called on by his Majesty to do so. For doing that, he had been visited by the hon. and learned Attorney General, and in his absence also, most severely; and the hon. and learned Attorney General had, in that way, replenished the barrenness of his speech with a fertility which had nothing to do with it. It had been said, that the House of Lords ought not to recommend prosecutions for libel, for that these cases of libel might afterwards go up to that House upon writs of error; but that was no argument against individual Peers expressing their opinions on such questions; for if it were, then no Peer who was a Privy Councillor ought, in that character, to recommend a prosecution for libel, because, in his other character of Peer, he might afterwards have to adjudicate on that very prosecution. But did the Attorney General need such recommendation in order to make him see what was necessary? He was prepared to go as far as any man in allowing full liberty of opinion, but personal abuse and political intimidation were a sort of tyranny exercised by the Press, and were now grown so virulent, that he put them on quite a different ground, and altogether discarded them from the rule as to the liberty of the Press. Were not most of the articles now written in the papers, written, not to convince, but to intimidate—not to influence the judgment by reason, but to beat down opposition by threats—intimidating the King and the Peers for daring to exercise those rights for which the Attorney General professed himself the advocate. The Press had taken the liberty of dictating to the House of Peers the manner in which they should act, and to threaten the Crown with extermination, unless it gave way to the free exercise of the opinion of all others but itself. The Press, too, had forbidden either House of Legislature to exercise its influence against that one-sided leader of public opinion. Of all the tyrannies that had ever existed—the tyranny of military despots—the tyranny of the Romish Church—of all tyrannies, civil or religious, the greatest was that of the Press, which, while it proclaimed freedom of opinion on one side, threatened with danger, disgrace, and death, those who should use that freedom of opinion on the other. He appealed to every man, whether that was not the moral and practical object of the present state of the Press, and of the Attorney General's conduct with respect to it, whose argument amounted to this; that, because recently there had been a great degree of excitement in the public mind; because the liberty of the Press, at first not attacked, had afterwards grown larger, and then become monstrous, and from monstrous had become overwhelming; and because it had become overwhelming, they were to give way to it at once. He hoped that, at least the Queen's Attorney General did not maintain that doctrine. The papers had been attacking the Queen for the last four or five months; at first gently, and at a distance; but the Attorney General did nothing, because he thought there was no doing anything with them, and that, if he approached them, he should get a slap in the face. When asked, why he did not go on against them, his answer was, that it was a bad matter, which could not be mended. Indeed, then it seemed, that there were degrees of progression, and the public Press had, at length, been allowed to arrive at that degree, that it dealt out proscription and extermination to two royal personages, unless they partook of the exercise of the "free opinion" which the Press alone thought fit to tolerate. Then the House had heard again that hackneyed doctrine, that hackney, cabriolet, or hackney-coach doctrine (and he did not complain of it because it was hackneyed, for he knew that *via trita* was often *via tuta*); but they had heard again that night that hackney-coach argument, that prosecution gave publicity to libels where, if the Attorney General was asleep, they would not have been read. That was a common card trick—a common *écarté* trick of argument, which had often been used before, but which was now exploded and rendered ridiculous. What was the result of that argument, but that there ought to be no prosecutions for any libels whatever, however atrocious? He now came to another argument of the hon. and learned Attorney General, who had complained of the libels of *The Times*. He (Sir Charles Wetherell) had not named *The Times*; for it was not their *Times;* it was *The Times* of the other side; it was the Attorney General's *Times*. It was a paper conducted by a very able writer; it was supposed to have very official knowledge; it received contributions from the most brilliant pens in this country; it was a kind of miscellany to which Gentlemen on the other side of the House united to contribute; it prided itself on the merit of publishing papers and letters, which, constitutionally, no man could know—no; none but a Cabinet Minister. It was a paper which knew what passed between the King and his Privy Council; it was prophetic as to what was to happen. His hon. and learned friend never read *The Times;* of course he could not; but if he did, he would find in its columns in the morning what was to happen, and what could only constitutionally be known to Cabinet Ministers. It united a growing power to great intelligence, and to great facilities for acquiring information; and, as he had before said, it knew of papers with which it could not become acquainted but in the most improper and unconstitutional manner. But who attacked it? Not he (Sir Charles Wetherell) but the Attorney General. Why? Because it had attacked him in reporting the speech of a noble and learned Lord, who, in another place, had entered on the question whether the Attorney General had or had not done his duty. But, on this occasion, he (Sir Charles Wetherell) must step in to defend *The Times*, and when the subject was Lord Lyndhurst's doctrine, he must assert that the noble Lord had done nothing more than his duty. The statement made in *The Times* was defensible on every principle known to the Constitution; and if the Attorney General prosecuted the paper, though he was not fond of making an offer of his services, he would defend *The Times* from that prosecution. The papers had libelled the Queen—not for a moral, but a political offence. They must all recollect, that the hon. Baronet, not now in his place, had called on the Attorney General to prosecute a certain paper for its libels on the late Queen; and if he were here now, he would, no doubt, with his accustomed eloquence, demand the same interposition on behalf of her present Majesty. It was true, that it was not the duty of this House to look out for prosecutions; but if the Attorney General neglected his duty, it would become the duty of that House to do this; for otherwise, if the Attorney General was a Reformer, there would be no such thing as a prosecution for libel.

Mr. *John Williams:* I was a silent, though zealous supporter, of that Bill to which the hon. and learned Gentleman has alluded; and from that charge, in both respects, he is certainly exempt—for supporter of it he undoubtedly was not; but as to silence, in the number of his speeches the hon. and learned Gentleman defied the power of arithmetic; they were beyond the means of reckoning, and human patience lagged behind his continued and unremitting exertions. My hon. and learned friend has called on me, as Attorney General for the Queen, to prosecute the Papers. In the first place, he attributes to me an honour that I know not I possess. Very early in the recent events I had the honour of resigning my office, and how far that resignation was effectual I do not know. But, in the next place, suppose it was otherwise, and that I was the Queen's Attorney General, I am not aware that I should possess the power of filing an *ex officio* information, even for a libel upon her Majesty. If not, then why am I to be appealed to? The Queen, though in many respects unlike other married ladies in the distinct rights and privileges she enjoys, is but the first subject of the realm; and, if she comes into the King's Courts, must appear there as a subject; and it would, therefore, be impossible for me, without a sort of earnestness of zeal, resembling that which the hon. Gentleman has exhibited, to take the step which he, without the law, supposes I might have resorted to. Through the whole of his argument—which, indeed, has not been much curtailed, and which, as there was no question before the House, he has carried to an extent beyond what might have been anticipated even from him—he has supposed that prosecutions for libel, and an end of libelling, are convertible terms. In making that supposition he has been unmindful of all the events of past history—unmindful of the occurrences which took place in the times of other Attornies-general, of those who prosecuted the public Press, and of those who were on the best terms with it. He has forgotten the Attorney-generalship of Sir Vicary Gibbs, who had nearly one-half of the public Press under prosecution. Did those prosecutions produce the desired effect—did they put an end to the system of libels, or stifle the indignant spirit which the public felt for the number of prosecutions then instituted? Directly the reverse. On many of those prosecutions the Attorney General was foiled—the public spirit rose in proportion to the violence of the attacks, and, so far from those attacks producing the effect that was desired, they produced the directly contrary result. Take, Sir, the converse of this proposition—take the example of a noble and learned Lord, who was Attorney General subsequently to the time I have mentioned. I may be mistaken, but I believe I am not, when I say that he had a virgin Attorney-generalship, like an hon. friend opposite me, he filed no *ex officio* informations whatever; and I will undertake to say, that no change more observable than that between his time and the time of the Attorney-generalship of Sir Vicary Gibbs could possibly be imagined. The circumstance of Sir John Copley's moderation and forbearance, in contrast with that of his predecessor, produced that effect which the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite thinks is to be produced by an over-zealous discharge of duty, but which I confess I think is not to be produced by that cause, for such conduct I believe to be more likely to fan the rising flame than to produce that quiet which he supposes. Does the hon. and learned Gentleman think that no allowance is to be made for a period of excitement? Does he believe it to be possible for the people to feel strongly and the Press to be silent? that the people should have strong feelings, should use strong language, and strong expressions, but that the Press should lag behind them? Does he wish it, does he desire it? If he does, I tell him that it is impossible, and would be improper; and I should have thought that his experience and knowledge of philosophy would have taught him that such an extraordinary difference, instead of assuaging, would have promoted and increased the irritation. I must ask my hon. and learned friend, as he puts questions to me with such freedom, whether it has never occurred to him, that, when any strong feeling exists, it may be continued by opposition, which is now known to be ineffectual, but which is still offensive? Cannot he find, and cannot the noble Lord discover, that it is just conceivable, that the time has arrived, when, in a case of this kind, the sort of hostility to which I have alluded may take away all the grace from concession, and that the effect of this hostility will be, to make the people believe that, instead of this measure being granted readily and willingly, it has been extorted from the parties who have granted it? The lecture which the hon. and learned Gentleman has read, may produce its effects upon my hon. and learned friend, who can file an *ex officio* information, but not upon me, for I cannot.

Sir *Charles Wetherell*, in explanation, said, that he never asserted the Queen's Attorney General could file an *ex officio* information, but he might have gone to the King's Attorney General, and asked him to file one.

Sir *Robert Peel* I think that an unfortunate departure from the usual practice has been made this evening by the Attorney General, who, in answer to a simple question, has delivered a speech which, from its tenor, must clearly have been matured in expectation of my noble friend's question. If, indeed, any attack had been made on the Attorney General by my noble friend in introducing this question, the learned Gentleman might have been justified in the course he has pursued; but, nothing could be more temperate or more courteous than the manner in which my noble friend brought these newspaper paragraphs under the notice of the hon. and learned Gentleman—paragraphs, too, which he himself admits to be libels on the highest persons in the realm. So courteous, indeed, was the manner of my noble friend, that I believe he did not even ask for an immediate answer to his question. In one part of the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech I entirely concur. There is no man who has had official experience connected with the Press, who can fail to be sensible of the danger of any crusade rashly directed against it. There are considerations of delicacy and prudence always to be attended to; and if you were to produce a hundred libels of the most disgusting nature, and at the same time show me, that the Attorney General had not prosecuted one of them, I certainly should not, from those two premises alone, draw the conclusion that he must necessarily have neglected his duty. In cases of obscene, or irreligious, or seditious publications, there are other considerations to be weighed beyond the simple one whether the strict letter of the law has or has not been violated. There is a question of political discretion as well as one of mere law. There are undoubtedly cases in which it is absolutely necessary that the Government should appeal to the law of the land, lest continued impunity should raise the belief that scandalous libels are viewed with indifference by the Government. In some cases it would be the duty of the Government, even if Ministers foresaw that a Jury would acquit, to throw that responsibility on the Jury; and I have known instances in which, when the law officers have, from the temper of the times, anticipated acquittals, I have signified to them the determination of the Cabinet, that they must nevertheless prosecute. I do not say that such a case has now arisen; I am only arguing on the general principle: but I entreat the Government to consider that principle, and ask itself seriously, if the time has not at length arrived when forbearance on their parts may produce greater evil than acquittal by a Jury; whether it will not amount to a notification that the libeller may henceforth enjoy complete and systematic impunity. There is danger in the impression, that, the more atrocious the libel, the more secure will it be from punishment, from an unwillingness to increase its publicity by prosecution. The part of the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech which I heard with the deepest regret was, the avowal of that opinion which was not necessarily extorted from him on the present occasion, and which, if it generally prevails in the King's councils, will be not only fatal to this Government, but to the existence of all Government. The doctrine which has been laid down by the hon. and learned Gentleman is no other than this—that no man ought to be prosecuted for the publication of his opinions, provided those opinions are sincere. Sir, I am sure that real and effective Government cannot co-exist with the practical adoption of that doctrine. Sincere opinions! Who is to determine whether opinions are sincere or not? The hon. and learned Gentleman said, in another part of his speech this evening, that he could not dive into the hearts of men—that he could not be a spy on their secret sentiments. True, but how, then, is he to know, when he meets with a libel full of sedition, whether the author of it be sincere in his opinions? Such a libel may be written by a man whose avowed object is confusion and anarchy, but who may be sincere in holding opinions which he knows will lead to the disorganization of society, and who will propagate them with the more zeal because he sincerely entertains them. But where is the test by which sincerity in opinions is to be tried? Is the mere avowal of sincerity to shield a libeller from prosecution? The sincerity of a man's opinions has nothing whatever to do with the policy or the justice of prosecution. The question is, whether the doctrines themselves are dangerous to the peace and happiness of society, and if they are so, it is the duty of the King's Government to shield society from the consequences of the public propagation of those doctrines. The hon. and learned Gentleman has announced a great latitude of opinion: with that opinion, so far as his mere personal capacity is concerned, I do not quarrel; but I complain, that the learned Gentleman has assumed the robe of the Attorney General for the purpose of paralysing the just authority of his office. It is the official station which he holds that makes his doctrines dangerous. Entertaining high respect for the learned Gentleman's private character—entertaining, also, high respect for his consistency in public life, yet I cannot conceive how he is able to reconcile the sentiments which he now avows, with the duties which devolve on him as the King's Attorney General. I would take the liberty of putting this question to him: I wish to ask him, what he thinks would have been the fate of the present Government of France if that government had acted on the doctrine that the publication of any opinion whatever, provided only that it was sincere, ought to be permitted? Suppose the learned Gentleman, on the establishment of the government of Louis Philippe, had been appointed that monarch's Attorney-general, would he have acted on the same principles as those which he now avows? or, if he had, would that government have withstood the reiterated attacks of the

Press? Does he mean to assert, that every sincere Carlist and every sincere Bonapartist ought to be allowed to assail with impunity the new government of France, and to encourage the people to open resistance? I will venture to say, that that government would not have existed for three months if it had pursued that course. But so far from attempting to act on that doctrine, the French ministry found it to be absolutely necessary, notwithstanding the extreme principles of liberality professed by that ministry, notwithstanding that M. Perier (the head of the ministry) had for many years been the determined opponent of the different governments of Charles 10th—I say the French ministry considered it absolutely necessary, for the salvation of the monarchy, to institute no less, I believe, than three or four hundred prosecutions against the Press in one year. And yet surely these prosecutions cannot be attributed to any desire on the part of M. Perier to control the liberty of the Press. The foundation of the present French government was laid in resistance to the illegal attempt of the former government to subdue the Press. But M. Perier said, and wisely, in my judgment, "If these attempts are made, both by the revolutionists and the Carlists, to excite the public mind against us, we will not have recourse to illegal ordinances, but we will have recourse to the Juries of the country and the laws of the land." And yet, all these opinions published in the French ultra papers, subversive of the government of Louis Philippe may be very sincere opinions. I do not doubt that the revolutionary papers are sincere, as well as the Carlist papers; but surely it is monstrous, to contend that sincerity in hostility ought to shield the enemies of a government from the enforcement of the ordinary law. The hon. and learned Gentleman has given us an account of the manner in which he acted when sitting in the capacity of a Judge. He has told us, that he had before him a culprit charged with a most scandalous publication, revolting to the best feelings of nature—not merely calling in question the truths of religion, but calling them in question in a manner so indecent, that no rational being could listen to either the substance or form of the publication without the utmost indignation and disgust. Now I can well understand that the hon. and learned Gentleman might doubt the policy of prosecuting this man—the policy of bringing these doctrines under the notice of the public. But this is not what the hon. and learned Gentleman said. He referred to the length of the man's imprisonment, and considered the sentence passed by himself, though warranted by law, to be morally unjust. He declares, that he felt uneasy during the continuance of the confinement of the man, and experienced great relief in his mind when the term of that imprisonment expired. The King's Attorney General publicly avows, that he considers it morally unjust to bring before the public tribunals, and punish acccording to law, those who sincerely entertain and publish opinions offensive to religion, or dangerous to the existence of government. If this be so, I foresee the establishment of a more sordid and degrading tyranny than any to which society has ever yet been exposed. To tell us that there is impunity for any libel against religion or Government, provided only that the opinion expressed is sincerely entertained—is, in other words, to tell us, that the grossest injuries may be committed—grosser than any inflicted by the confiscation of property—grosser even, to a man of honour, than any that can threaten his life—and that every hope of redress is excluded. Sir, this is a novel, and, I believe, a most dangerous doctrine. The hon. and learned Gentleman has referred to the early periods of his life, and has told us, that he derived from high authority those lessons of constitutional learning which he has observed in his subsequent course. But let me ask him, did Mr. Fox, Mr. Sheridan, or Lord Erskine, think that, because men sincerely held opinions, it was, therefore, perfectly safe to allow them to promulgate them without notice or prosecution? Does the learned Gentleman recollect the libel of Mr. John Reeves against the two Houses of Parliament? If not, I can inform him, that the persons then in Opposition never sanctioned the doctrine, that because Mr. Reeves really entertained the opinion that the House of Lords and the House of Commons were branches which might be lopped off without injury to the monarchy, which was the trunk, he ought, therefore, to go unquestioned for giving publicity to such a doctrine. If I remember right, Mr. Sheridan made two motions on that subject; the one was, that the libel should be burnt by the common hangman, and the other was, that Mr. Reeves should be prosecuted by the Attorney General. In vain did Mr. Reeves say, that he was sincere in his opinion; he was prosecuted at the instance of the learned Gentleman's high authorities, and in spite of his sincerity! It is, certainly, true, that the learned Gentleman somewhat qualified his doctrine by saying, that the sincere opinions must not excite to acts of violence. But doctrines subversive of society may easily be propagated, which at the same time shall not incite to direct violence. For instance, it has very lately been maintained, that the time for putting an end to the discipline of the soldier has come. The men who entertain this opinion, publicly proclaim, that it is not the duty of the army to array itself on the side of the law; and shall such persons with safety be told, that they may publish this doctrine, and do what they can to induce the soldier to forget his duty, and violate his allegiance? Are we, too, to be told, that it is not the duty of the Attorney General to stand forward and appeal to the laws of the country in such a case? I cannot but deeply lament when I hear such doctrines promulgated by those in authority. It is clear, that it is not merely the Reform Bill that we are engaged in passing. It is not merely this one experiment which we are going to make on the Constitution of the country—an experiment which even its advocates say, though necessary, is dangerous. No; what I lament even more than the passing of the Reform Bill is, that when the public mind is excited, the Government does not take measures, measures that are quite compatible with the success of Reform, to allay the public fever, and assuage the hot-headed violence that is abroad. In the present state of the public Press, the Attorney General has expressed himself in a manner wholly uncalled for, and stated views and sentiments that, in the Attorney General, cannot be otherwise than mischievous. He has stated, that it is painful to his conscience to sentence a notorious offender for a gross libel against religion, because that libel might, by chance, contain the offender's sincere opinions. By such expressions as these, he has tied his own hands, and will be incapable of instituting with effect any prosecutions that may hereafter be necessary. Let it not be supposed that I am bringing any charge against the learned Gentleman for his official conduct heretofore. So far from it, I witnessed with pleasure his manly prosecutions of Mr. Carlile and Mr. Cobbett; though I cannot help observing, that he did not then stop to inquire whether the libels which he prosecuted, contained the sincere opinions of those writers. No; he only inquired whether the libels were mischievous in their tendency. He inquired into their probable effect—he found they were calculated to encourage incendiarism, and he, therefore, prosecuted the authors. What was the result of those prosecutions? One was convicted. It is true the other escaped; but under what circumstances? "Eleven of the Jury," says the hon. and learned Gentleman (though, by the way, I do not know how he got at that fact) "were for a conviction; but the twelfth, who was a friend of Mr. Cobbett's, starved the eleven into acquiescing in his opinion." But surely such an accident as this is no argument against future prosecutions; and to be deterred from prosecuting, because, by accident, there has been one man on a Jury able to control his fellows into an improper verdict, is to be deterred by a phantom which should not be allowed to terrify a manly mind. I cannot help hoping that the opinions expressed by the hon. and learned Gentleman, have been expressed incautiously and without mature deliberation. At all events I can assure him, that nothing would give me greater pleasure, than to learn that I have misunderstood what he said; for, in the present times, and in those which I foresee will succeed the present, I cannot conceive any opinion more dangerous to the government of the country than the doctrine, that a man may not only maintain, but propagate, any principles among the deluded and infuriated multitude, provided he sincerely entertains them.

The *Attorney General:* I hope I may be allowed to trespass on the indulgence of the House, as I cannot help explaining, somewhat fully, that which the right hon. Baronet has most grievously misunderstood. I never said that, in my judgment, sincerity of opinion was to protect a man from prosecution; on the contrary, I said that I could not dive into men's hearts; I also said, that it was not my personal feeling that was to regulate this matter; but my feeling of what was due to the security of the public and to the honour of the Crown. More than this is unnecessary; and, while I entertain these principles, which I believe to be as just as I know them to be sincere, I shall not take the advice of the right hon. Gentleman (though I receive it with all the candour that is due to it), to resign my office into hands in which the duties of it may not, perhaps, be more conscientiously discharged, even though the right hon. Baronet himself should appoint my successor. I do not know what his opinion of the duties of an Attorney General may be, but my opinion is this—that he is to do all that in his conscience he believes to be right, for the purpose of protecting the peace of the country and the honour of the Crown. The right hon. Gentleman has asked me my opinion of the conduct of the French government. In the first place, I beg to say, that there is no sort of parallel between a new government emerging from the revolution of the barricades—between the ancient and long-established government of England, and the new government of France; but I believe that, instead of the latter having been strengthened, it has been materially injured by the multitude of prosecutions that the French ministry have thought proper to institute. As to the example set by Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan in the case of Mr. John Reeves, I think, at all events, that that is not an example in favour of such prosecutions, and, least of all, by order of the House of Commons. I believe that it is now very generally felt, that it would have been much better to have left Mr. Reeves's case alone, and to have let him go forward in his foolish extravagance without molestation: the prosecution, however, arose from the folly and heat of the party feeling of the day, which, I must say, was provoked by the still greater folly of the party feeling evinced by the other side. I, therefore, again beg to say, that I distinctly disavow that which the right hon. Gentleman has assigned to me, though I might, in my ill command of language, have led the right hon. Gentleman to the conclusion to which he came. Let me also remind the right hon. Gentleman, that I looked to other consequences besides that which he has quoted, as if it had been the solitary one on which I rested my argument; for, though I said that sincerity of opinion was one of those circumstances which would make me reluctant to prosecute, yet I only mentioned it as one of numerous others which would weigh with me, as Attorney General, before I committed the honour of the Crown to the uncertain issue of a legal prosecution. Indeed, I may say, that I mentioned all the objections which the right hon. Gentleman has himself laid down, and particularly that of giving a greater publicity, and thereby increasing the atrocity of the venom. I admit that, throughout the whole of this debate, we have, in a manner, been letting out secrets; and I, therefore, think it would have been better if such a question had not been put in this House as that proposed by the noble Lord (Lord Stormont); for even the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman himself—built as they are on official experience—are encouragements to the repetitions of libel. I, therefore, think that it would be much better not to discuss these matters, whereby we shall be avoiding, as far as we can, the introduction of them to the notice of the public. The right hon. Gentleman has also thought proper to make a sort of reprehension on me for entering so largely on this subject, when it only came before the House in the shape of a question proposed to me—I admit, in a most courteous manner—by the noble Lord. But I would ask the noble Lord himself, whether, after what has been said in this House and the other House of Parliament, and whether, after his having given notice of this very question, it would not have been a surprise to him, and an apparent dereliction of duty in me, if I had not taken the opportunity of stating some of the reasons which, in my view, make these prosecutions unadvisable? I really think, after all, that there is no great difference of opinion between us on the principle of the thing: we have only stated some considerations, which have more or less strength according to our different situations; but I do not feel that, in any thing (except as to the sincerity of a man's opinions), I differ from the right hon. Gentleman — unless, indeed, in degree. With respect to the particular case I mentioned to the House, I did so because I thought it was a strong illustration of the want of power on the part of the Attorney General to put an end to a libel; for, notwithstanding the abhorrent nature of the publication, the public feeling was far from going along with the sentence, and I myself (as I must again repeat) was glad when the term of the man's imprisonment had expired; not that I believe the sentence was unjust, but because I felt that he was a young man just come to town, who probably did not know what he was doing, and who was led away by a false enthusiasm in an honest belief of the sincerity of his cause. I now only have to thank the House for its indulgence in having listened to me, and again to repeat, that, as Attorney General, I am giving up no power that belongs to the Crown. I am only standing up for a careful and forbearing use of it, which, I believe, will not only conduce to the protection of property, but to the well-being of the whole community.

Sir *Robert Peel:* I think that all who heard the hon. and learned Gentleman will confirm me in my impression, that he laid down the doctrine that the sincerity of opinions was an apology for a libel, without any qualification whatever, excepting that the libel must not incite to actual violence. I certainly recognise a distinction between the new government of France and the ancient government of England; but no distinction that is available to the learned Gentleman's argument on the injustice of punishing sincere opinions, and I can see many circumstances, even in this ancient government, which may call for the active interference of the law for the purpose of repressing the too great licentiousness of the Press.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* thought it would have been quite inconsistent of his Majesty's Government to turn round and institute prosecutions against the Press, when so much had been done by them and their supporters in that House to inflame the public mind. He believed hon. Members were not acquainted with the violent and scandalous libels which were every day published. Some spoke of his Majesty being under petticoat government, and advised the people not to put their trust in princes. Her Majesty they spoke of as bringing with her all the political infection of her tyrannous country. Royalty was denounced, and the block was said to be the best place for kings. The cry of others was, "Down with the Priests and the Lords," and, conjoined with this, the people were told that the nobility and gentry unjustly took their property from them. The hon. Member then read several other violent extracts from publications, the titles of which he did not mention, and concluded by stating that he should every week bring down extracts from such of those publications as came under his notice, and, after holding them up to the reprobation of the House, the responsibility would rest on his Majesty's Government if they did not prosecute the libellers, and put an end to such inflammatory and seditious publications.

Lord *Althorp:* I hope that the hon. Gentleman will not persevere in reading those papers to the House once a week; for he very truly says that it is probable that a great number of the Members of this House do not know even of the existence of the Papers from which he is to quote; to which I may add, that it is also probable that a great majority of the people of England are equally ignorant of them; and, therefore, if the hon. Gentleman, week after week, reads all the most objectionable passages, he will be in a fair way of giving them a prosperous sale. Agreeing in much of what has fallen from the right hon. member for Tamworth, I think that one of the dangers of prosecuting these libels will be, to give the defendant an opportunity of making an impudent defence in a Court of Justice, whereby the publicity of his paper will be very much increased. But there are other circumstances which we are also bound to take into consideration—the state of the excitement in the country at the present moment, for instance; though, at the same time, I admit, that whatever that excitement may be on general political subjects, it cannot at all justify the personal attacks which have lately been made. I am sure that in making this statement I am only expressing the general feeling of the House; but if we once enter into a crusade of prosecutions of this sort, so far from doing good to the cause of government, morality, or freedom of opinion, so called, I am afraid that we shall be inflicting on all these a most serious injury.

Mr. *Hunt* thanked the hon. member for Dundalk, on behalf of the proprietors of the papers he had taken so much pains to bring into notice. As to Mr. Hetherington, with whom he was intimately acquainted, he could take on himself to say, that that Gentleman was very sincere in his opinions. The Attorney General had given him infinite pleasure by the speech which he had delivered that night. He never thought to have lived to hear such a speech from an Attorney General. He went the whole length which the hon. and learned Gentleman went; and his speech had given him (Mr. Hunt) so much satisfaction, that he could be almost content to die without hearing another speech. As to the person who had been sentenced by the Attorney General when Common Serjeant, he was one of Mr. Carlile's men, named Humphrey Boyle, and it was not the severity of the sentence which had given dissatisfaction, but the man made a very bold defence, and some persons supposed that the sentence was more severe because of the boldness with which the defendant maintained his opinions. Now, he wished to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he had not increased the man's imprisonment, because he had made what was called an impudent defence. [*The Attor-General:* Certainly not.] Well, at all events, it had so been reported. He also wished to know why the prosecution against Mr. Cobbett had been suspended? Was it not because Mr. Hume had written to Earl Grey, to dissuade him from the prosecution, because Mr. Cobbett was so strenuous an advocate for the Reform Bill? He understood that it was; and if the Attorney General would not afford any information on the subject, he would, some day move for a copy of the letter. The effect of suspending Mr. Cobbett's prosecution was, that Mr. Carlile was tempted to write a still stronger article the following week, for which he was prosecuted and convicted. Only a week back, and coaches, omnibuses and all were christened Adelaide. Half the boys and girls, too, who were born were christened Adelaide; and now the name was all at once wiped out from the omnibuses, and the boys and girls were ashamed of it. He remembered when he came first to London—he was then fourteen years of age—that he had to walk from the Saracen's Head to Newgate, and in the Old Bailey he perceived a very bad smell. He found that this arose from the burning of a woman who had been found guilty of coining farthings. There were no laws to exempt females from punishment, and if the Queen had done any wrong—though he did not say she had—she might be liable to punishment. At least there was nothing, as the hon. Member said, unmanly, offensive, or ungentlemanly, in calling a woman to account. He would not trespass further on the attention of the House, but sit down, thanking his Majesty's Government and the Attorney General for having acted, as he thought, a very prudent part in abstaining from prosecution.

Mr. *Shaw* congratulated the Attorney General on the compliments he had received from the hon. member for Preston. When it went forth that the member for Preston approved of the course taken by the Attorney General, in not prosecuting the Press, it would no doubt be highly advantageous to the hon. and learned Gentleman. The compliments must be doubly valuable, inasmuch as the hon. Member had accompanied them by some observations equally laudatory on Mr. Hetherington, the Editor of *The Poor Man's Guardian,* a paper published, as Mr. Hetherington expressly declared "in defiance of the law, in order to try the power of right against might." He mentioned this, because this was one of the publications which fell within the Attorney General's own description of publication which ought to be prosecuted, for it was an incitement to crime. With respect to the subject under discussion, he was of Blackstone's opinion as to libel, and thought that the best way to preserve the liberty of the Press was to restrain its licentiousness.

Mr. *John Campbell* said, he should not presume to offer any advice to the Attorney General, as to what publications should be selected for prosecution—that was no part of the duty of the House of Commons. If an Attorney General misconducted himself, let a charge be brought against him, and let the House deal with that charge as justice should require; but it appeared to him that that House would not only waste time, but would act most inexpediently if, in that preliminary stage, it expressed any opinion that certain publications ought or ought not to be prosecuted. The Members of that House were not the constitutional judges of such a question. When an officer of the Crown neglected his duty, then would be the time for the House of Commons to interfere; but to point out such matters would only prevent the officers of the Crown from doing that duty which, he was sure, would be performed creditably to the individual to whose hands it was confided, and advantageously to the country.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR SCOTLAND—SECOND READING.] The

Order of the Day for the second reading of the Reform of Parliament (Scotland) Bill was then read.

The *Lord Advocate* said, that in moving that this Bill should be now read a second time, it was not his intention to enter at all into the clauses of the Bill, as it had been in the hands of Members for many months. But it appeared to him advisable to remind the House that this Bill, following up the principles of the English Reform Bill, had been carried to a second reading in the last Session of Parliament, by a larger majority than any other question during the Session. He should, therefore, feel that he was doing very wrong if he detained the House by any repetition of the arguments in favour of the measure, or by any observations on its necessity. Reserving to himself the privilege of reply to any objections which might be urged, or in explanation in case of any inquiries, which Gentlemen were, of course, at full liberty to make if they thought proper, he should confine himself at present to mentioning in a very few words the changes which the parties to whom the care of the Bill was confided had thought it would be right to introduce into it, and he trusted, that after the second reading the House would have no objection to allow the Bill to be committed *pro forma*, in order that those alterations might be made in it. The first change which it was necessary for him to mention was the separation of the county of Argyle from the isle of Bute. In the next place in order to meet other objections, a slight change was proposed with regard to the proprietors of 10*l.* tenements in boroughs. The only other material alteration, except verbal alterations was one which related to the machinery of registering votes, which was to be transferred from the Sheriff's clerks to the town clerks. There were some minor changes, with which he did not feel it necessary to take up the time of the House. He should, therefore, conclude by moving that the Bill be read a second time.

Sir *George Clerk* said, that after the protracted discussions which had taken place upon the general question of Reform, and as the working of the Scotch Reform Bill was but part and parcel of the greater measure which had already received the sanction of the House, he should feel himself guilty of an unpardonable waste of time if he were to repeat the arguments which had been urged with much greater force by many of his hon. friends. But it was impossible for him to allow this motion for reading the Bill a second time to pass, without declaring, in a few words, his unchanged opinions with regard to the whole question of Reform. The hon. member for Winchilsea had complained of the excitement of the country, which he attributed to the opponents of the measure. After the declarations which had been made by his Majesty's Ministers, of their having security for carrying the Bill, he felt that any thing that he could say would be of little avail; but yet he could not, even at the risk of being charged by the hon. member for Winchilsea with offensive perseverance, refrain from expressing his opinions of the evil effects which the measure would produce to the country. After what had been said by the learned Lord Advocate, he was not disposed to give the House the trouble of dividing upon this question. He should only enter his protest against the measure, and say, that no man would rejoice more than he should, if the learned Lord could use any arguments which would remove his apprehensions of the great and serious evils which were likely to result from this fearful experiment. There were three great principles in the English Bill of Reform; disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and an extension of the suffrage. The third of these more particularly applied itself to Scotland. With regard to the principle of disfranchisement, with the solitary exceptions of the two county towns of Peebles and Selkirk—which exceptions would, he hoped, disappear in Committee—there was no place at present enjoying the franchise which it was proposed to deprive of it altogether. With regard to the principle of enfranchisement, he was not aware that the most violent Anti-Reformer connected with Scotland objected to additional Representatives being given to the large manufacturing towns of that country. On the contrary, it was contended that, from change of circumstances since the Union, the proportion of Representation then given to Scotland, as also the proportion given to it under this Bill, was not large enough, especially when the practical effects which would be produced by the annihilation of those small boroughs in England were considered, through which, by means, perhaps, not the most regular, persons connected with Scotland had hitherto been enabled to come into the House. He had no doubt that the hon. member for Perth, who had given notice of his intention to submit a motion upon this subject in Committee, would be able to make out such a case as would satisfy the House of the reasonableness of the expectations entertained by Scotland with respect to it. As to the extension of the suffrage, if it had been thought right to extend it in England, where it was already popular, there could be no doubt that it should also be extended in Scotland, where it had never been contended that the Representation was popular. Perhaps, if Parliament had decided that the occupation of a house of a certain value, in an English borough, should be a sufficient qualification for a party's voting for a Member of Parliament, he saw nothing so peculiar in the constitution of large cities in Scotland, as to render that which Parliament had deemed fit for London, Bath, Manchester, and Liverpool, unfit for Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Glasgow. The greatest objection he should have to urge in Committee was to the nature of the franchise which it was intended to establish in the counties of Scotland. He did not wish to retain the present qualification for counties, and should be willing to put an end to all merely nominal qualifications; but if the learned Lord had wished to give facility to the creation of nominal and occasional votes, it would hardly have been possible for him to devise a phraseology which could more completely accomplish that object than the words of the Bill would do. In his opinion, all must agree that any right of franchise in the counties of Scotland, however small it might be, should be derivable from land. One of the great arguments urged in favour of the English Bill was, the increased influence given to the agricultural interest in the increase of county Members. Now, the practical effect of the change proposed to be introduced into Scotland would be nearly to annihilate the agricultural interest, and to give undue weight to the owners of houses in large towns, which were not royal boroughs. Indeed, the number of persons who would vote in respect of house property, without having any permanent interest in land, would be so great that the Members returned for the Scotch counties would rather represent the commercial and manufacturing than the agricultural interest. Those interests, rightly considered, ought not to be placed in opposition; but questions would arise in legislation, the decision of which, one way or the other, it was thought by the people, would benefit one interest and not the other. And as, under this new system, the House would be more liable to be acted upon by popular impressions, taken up without due information, it became doubly necessary that there should be persons representing those separate interests. On a former occasion, when presenting a petition from a number of persons possessed of freeholds, who would by the Bill be deprived of the right of voting, he had stated, that a further effect of it would be, to introduce confusion into the titles of small proprietors in Scotland. He would not then go into technical details, but when in Committee, he hoped to be able to show, that a sweeping change of this kind had to overcome many difficulties. He could not expect the Lord Advocate, or the noble Lord near him, to look with a favourable eye upon suggestions which came from one who described himself then, as formerly, an uncompromising opposer of the measure, but he trusted they would apply for advice to those who supported them all through this question, and they would doubtless find, that it was generally thought, even among the Reformers of Scotland, that no great degree of prudence had been shown in the selection of the qualification for county voters. He might state, without fear of contradiction, that the excitement in favour of Reform, which was appealed to as prevailing in Scotland, rather regarded the state of the borough Representatives to large towns than the peculiar qualification which it was proposed to establish with respect to counties. If the noble Lord opposite would agree to the proposed amendment of the right hon. member for Perth, to allow the large counties of Scotland to return two Members instead of one, his (Sir George Clerk's) objection would be in part obviated, for if the commercial and agricultural interests were almost equally divided, the latter would at any rate return one Member. There was another mode in which a part of this objection might be obviated, though the suggestion of it might not be received with favour by English Members, namely, that those who were to vote in respect to house property should be thrown into the constituency of the borough near to which that property was situated—a plan something analogous to the system of contributory boroughs prevailing in Wales and Scotland. It could not be denied, that a man who derived an income of 10*l.* per annum from land, had a more valuable property than one who derived the same amount of income from a house, for the former was of permanent value, whilst the latter was liable to continual fluctuations and constant deterioration. The average price of land was about thirty years' purchase, whilst the average price of a house was about twelve or fifteen years' purchase; so that it was a moderate calculation to say, that house property, producing the same amount of income as property in land, was only half the value of the latter. The qualification for voting for counties should, therefore, be confined to persons who had a freehold, giving to all persons, however, who had inferior rights of property, power of going to the persons who held superiorities over them, and requiring them to sell their superiorities at fixed prices. A similar principle was followed with regard to tithes a century and a half ago. It might be said, that this would involve proprietors in considerable expense in making out their titles, but he had already stated, that the practical effect of the Bill would be, to render it necessary for all proprietors to renew their titles. He had ventured to make these suggestions, not with any view of throwing unnecessary difficulties in the way of the Bill; for, however much he might regret its passing, he looked upon it, as far as this House was concerned, as practically carried. His wish, therefore, was, as far as possible to obviate, in some degree, a few of the evils which must, at any rate, attend its passing. Such being his object, he sincerely hoped that the Lord Advocate, and the noble Lord opposite, would take into their councils, not Anti-Reformers, but some of the most zealous Reformers in Scotland; as he was certain they would then have pointed out to them the inconveniences that must attend the system they had adopted with regard to counties, and would, for the sake of the agricultural interest, make some alteration in it. No person would be more delighted than himself to find that the evils he anticipated from the passing of this measure did not take place. He hoped that that Providence which had so long made this country more prosperous than any other portion of the civilized world, would, in its goodness, avert from the country those mischiefs which, he feared, they were about to bring upon it.

Mr. *Fysche Palmer* said, it ought to excite no surprise that he took part in this discussion, since he had, on a former occasion, submitted a Motion to the House for the Reform of the Scotch Representation. He very well remembered the trial and imprisonment of Mr. Muir and Mr. Palmer, for having promoted Reform in Scotland. They encouraged the people of Scotland to petition for their rights, and for this they were punished. The words they used were—"to claim for themselves a full, fair, and free Representation of the people in Parliament." These very words were now ringing from one end of Scotland to the other, and for using them were Muir and Palmer sent to Botany Bay. They were sentenced to be transported for using words that were now idolised throughout Scotland. They were treated as if they had been guilty of highway robbery. They were sent to the hulks, where he had visited Mr. Palmer, and found him loaded with irons, and placed amidst housebreakers, footpads, and highwaymen. These men were punished for saying that Scotland was entitled to a full and fair Representation. That was forty years ago. What a change had now taken place! The actions for which men were then punished were now idolised throughout the country. What had brought about this change? Had not persecution tried to prevent it? Banishment had been tried; other punishments had been tried; but they had not prevented the effect of those principles which were calculated to benefit society. The measure of Reform was now beyond the power of man to stop it, and he was convinced that it was calculated to add to the happiness of the people. What was the cause of this great change? For forty years the Government had opposed it. Had it been brought about by the Whigs and Radicals out of office? Was it the fruit of Whig or Tory councils? Gentlemen had talked of re-action; but those who looked upon the events of the last ten days would never talk of re-action again. There was scarcely a town in England and Scotland which had not come forward in favour of the Bill. He had taken the pains to inquire after those which had opposed it, and he had scarcely found one. There was no re-action, and he should be glad now to hear any man assert in that House that there was. The whole people were in favour of Reform, and that showed a great change in the opinion of the country. Was that the result of the misrule of the last forty years? Did it arise from the pressure of enormous taxation? Was it caused by that change of the currency which had at once doubled the amount of the taxes paid by the industrious classes, though it did not come into full operation till 1825? Whether arising from these or other causes, there now was a general feeling in favour of Reform, and when that Bill which had been so well fought in that House became the law, he did not doubt that the Members who had stood by it and done their duty, would receive, what they were well entitled to—the thanks of the country.

Colonel *Lindsay* said, he should be happy if the results which the honourable Gentleman predicted were to come to pass. After the course which things had taken, he felt that it would be useless for him to oppose the measure, and his object, therefore, was, to make it productive of as little mischief as possible. The great change which was now about to be made was not a restoration, or a correction of abuses. It was a clear and distinct new Constitution. He would show this by the learned Lord's own words, on moving that the former Bill be read a second time. 'He would then at once de-'clare that the object of the Bill was, not 'to take away any part of the system, but 'to take down the whole of it—to take 'it down altogether, for the whole principle 'was bad. He gloried in making the avowal 'that no shred or rag, no jot or tittle of it 'was to be left.'* These words were certainly delivered in the set phrase of speech, but the sentiments were the sentiments of Jack Cade, the first English Reformer. He said, "I've thought upon it: it shall be so. Away, burn all the records of the realm; my mouth shall be the Parliament of England." Such, too, were the sentiments of the learned Lord; his were precisely the sentiments of Jack Cade. The learned Lord argued that a great change was necessary, and he said, if he understood the learned Lord right, that by greatly extending the franchise, the people would be satisfied, and the means of their prosperity provided. But in Ireland the franchise was much more extensive than it had ever been in Scotland, and he had yet to learn that the people of that country were either satisfied or prosperous. He had always understood that they were discontented and miserable. Other causes were assigned for this, but certainly the extent of the Representation had not saved Ireland from being more wretched than Scotland. Turning to England, he begged leave to ask, whether the advantages possessed by this country were so great that Scotland ought to be anxious to change her own institutions for those of England? He saw no such difference in the prosperity of the two countries. The Bill would effect a total change in all the existing institutions under which Scotland had so long thriven—a change, too, which would, in his opinion, be anything but beneficial. It was, however, argued on the other side, that if those ancient institutions were so valuable, why were not the Gentlemen from Scotland a little more strenuous in their defence of them? He, however, thought that an ample apology had been on many occasions offered on their behalf, which, though it might not be so wittily or so eloquently urged as it might have been had any of the hon. Members from Ireland been their advocates, sprung from as ardent a feeling of patriotism as any defence of their own rights. The change in the character of the electors might change the description of Representatives who would be sent to that House; but though they might be more eloquent—though they might be able to address a large and popular assembly with greater effect, yet the interests of the country would not be better taken care of than they were at present. The principles of the Bill being admitted, he had a right to call upon them to apply those principles impartially. To show the injustice with which Scotland was treated in the appointment of her Representation, he should refer to the same data by which the English Representation had been guided, in order to show how differently the former country had been treated in this respect. The census of 1821 states the population of England and Wales to amount to 11,978,875, that of Scotland is stated to be about 2,093,000, which is considerably above one-sixth of that of England. The revenue contributed by England amounted at the same epoch to 40,900,280*l.*;

---

* Hansard, (third series) vol. vii. p. 536.

that derived from Scotland to 5,113,353*l.*; the proportion which the latter country bore in this respect to England, was about one-eighth. Now, compare the relative proportion between the number of Representatives sent by the two countries, and let the House answer whether Scotland had justice done her, and whether it was fair to lay down certain principles upon which the extent of Representation was supplied in England, and to show so total a disregard to those principles, when the Representation of Scotland came under their consideration, as to deny their application to the situation of that country. He could not help expressing a strong hope, that the suggestion which had just been thrown out by the hon. member for Edinburgh (Sir George Clerk) would meet with the consideration which, in his opinion, it so well merited. The Bill as at present constructed would tend to make all the Judges and the clergy in Scotland political partisans, and it would have the effect also of inducing the gentry there to lavish their property in contested elections. Unless the modifications of the franchise which had been recommended, and the other alterations which had been suggested, were to be carried into effect before the Bill left that House, he was convinced it would prove, not that benefit which the people so ardently expected from it, but as great a curse as was ever inflicted on them.

Mr. *Andrew Johnstone* contended, that the Scottish people had expressed an intense desire for Reform, and that they had also expressed their wishes to be in favour of even so large a Reform as that which it was proposed to effect by the Bill before the House. Hon. Members had been pleased to say, that Scotland had derived the chief of her present advantages, both in wealth and other respects, from the benefits which were conferred on her since her union with England; but those benefits were, in his opinion, chiefly the result of her own industry; nor did the chief of her popular institutions—namely, her Church, arise from her connexion with England. The Church of Scotland had stood the test of time, and had thereby proved the excellence of the principles upon which that structure was based, and moreover he asserted, that the very reason why the Church of Scotland had proved so excellent an institution was, that it was founded on such popular principles, and not on any legislative proceedings. It was sufficiently notorious to all that the Church of Scotland was reared in despite of the strenuous exertions of the reigning prince to extinguish its growth, and to put it down altogether; and that prince was assisted in no small degree by the Members of the Legislature, who, in their eagerness to appropriate the Church property, had shown themselves, during that struggle, much more ready to assist than to resist the endeavours which were then made to quell the growth of that Church, which was now so great a blessing to the land, and which now proved to be the most valuable institution possessed by Scotland. It was not, either, an unknown circumstance that the majority of forty-five who sat in that House, and of the sixteen who sat in another place, as Representatives of Scotland, had ever been celebrated for paying more attention to their own interests than to those of their nominal constituents, the public; and, with very few exceptions, those hon. and noble Representatives would be found to have voted constantly in the Treasury majorities, for which they did not go unrewarded, nor did they neglect the frequent opportunities which occurred to remit the proceeds of their gains to Scotland. Generally speaking, the county Representatives in Scotland were chosen, under the present system, by the nomination of several noble Lords; and they would be found, with very few exceptions, to be selected with a view to give support to the Ministers. The hon. Member opposite (Colonel Lindsay) was certainly an exception to this remark; for he was chosen as Representative for the county, solely because of his Anti-Ministerial opinions. It was, however, useless to enter into any lengthened argument upon the necessity of granting Reform to Scotland, for it was only necessary to show the House the miserable state in which that country had for years been in that respect, to convince them that the present Bill was a mere measure of justice, and that it ought to be conceded without any material modifications, or any further delay. Under the present system of Representation, the Members from Scotland had enjoyed for a series of years an uninterrupted career of prosperity, both in great and in small things; although, in many cases, the trifling and inferior posts in the Customs and Excise, were not personally available to them, yet such small blessings were highly acceptable to their friends in the borough. But this system ought to be put an end to, and neither Scotland nor her Representatives ought any longer to be degraded by such a traffic, or to be subjected to the reproach which was justly cast upon her people on that account. With respect to the future extension of the franchise, he was desirous to see that privilege conferred wherever the claims of education gave a title, and he thought that it ought to be bounded by that condition. There was one most important feature in connexion with this subject, which he could not pass over, and with which he should conclude his observations. He would entreat the learned Lord to keep the clergy of Scotland perfectly unconnected with political matters. He implored the Government to do so, because the influence which the Scotch clergy exercised over the people was well known; and if there was the least chance of the clergy being converted into political agents, or of even a portion of them being so converted, no idea could be formed of the miserable results which might arise. He hoped and trusted—believing, as he did, that the sentiments of a large majority of Scotch Members, on both sides of the House, were in favour of this view of the case — that his Majesty's Ministers would be pleased to take this matter into their most serious consideration. The case might be widely different with regard to England. He drew no parallel between the cases of the two countries, for it was well known, that the constitution of the Church of Scotland stood on a perfectly different footing from that of the Church of England. At present, he believed, that not above twenty Scotch clergymen were entitled to exercise the franchise. The hon. member for Edinburgh said, he anticipated great evils from the Bill, and, though he was not one of those persons who fell under the description of the hon. Baronet, the member for Edinburgh, as golden dreamers—persons who expected the Reform Bill to work miracles in Scotland, and to remove all the difficulties and burthens under which they laboured in that country—he was still one of those who believed, that after the mature and lengthened consideration which the subject had received from the Legislature, the Bill before them could not fail of producing the effects which it was intended to bring about, and he certainly participated in the hopes which had been expressed by hon. Members who supported the Bill, of its ultimately being attended with the best results.

Mr. *J. T. Hope* concurred in the observations which had been made by the hon. Baronet, the member for Edinburgh; at the same time he must observe, that whilst he was ready to admit the necessity which existed for some change in the Representative system of Scotland, he could not but look upon those which were contemplated by the present Bill, as not only of too sweeping a nature, but as tending to produce the most alarming consequences to that country. He did not deny the existence of a strong feeling throughout Scotland in favour of Reform, but he could not help noticing, that very great difference of opinion existed amongst the Members who advocated Reform and supported the Bill: the learned Lord Advocate asserted that the cry for Reform arose from the increased intelligence amongst the Scottish people; whilst another hon. Member declared it to have originated in the tyranny of a Tory Government. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. A. Johnstone) had been pleased to cast the stigma of interest over the conduct of the forty-five Representatives of Scotland in that House. He must, however, deny that those Representatives had been actuated by personal motives, or that they had only sought to serve their own interests in voting with the Ministers. He contended that in their parliamentary conduct they had ever acted for the benefit of that country on behalf of which they sat there, and the imputation cast upon them by the hon. Member was wholly undeserved by them.

Sir *George Warrender* expressed a strong wish that the present Bill should prove a final measure with respect to Reform in Scotland, which, in its present condition, he feared it would not be. It was on this account that he had felt extremely glad to hear from the Lord Advocate, that it was his intention to extend the 10*l.* franchise in Scotland, in the way that had been explained to the House; and he could not, for these reasons, follow the right hon. member for Edinburgh in the counsel which he gave the House, to shorten instead of widening the extent of the franchise, because it was his opinion, that such a course would render it necessary at some future period to pass another measure, granting that which he now proposed to refuse. For himself, also, in his condition as a country gentleman, and as such interested in the agriculturists of Scotland, he must confess, that he did not participate in the fears which were entertained by the right hon. Baronet, that the operation of the Bill would have an unfavourable effect upon the agricultural portion of the population of Scotland.

Lord *Loughborough* said, the question had often been asked—whence arose the cry for Reform? and answers as contradictory as various had been given to that question. In his opinion, the demand for Reform originated in the distress which pervaded all classes. Whether that distress had resulted from the changes in the currency, the introduction of the free trade system, or from the other assigned causes, he knew not; but he must say, that the commerce and manufactures of the kingdom were in a state of deep distress and depression, and it was to Reform, that all people were taught to look for relief from the condition in which they found themselves. The only answer, in fact, which was now made to their demand for relief was, that Reform should be granted to them, and they would find relief from that; relief, not only from taxation, but also from the other burthens under which they groaned. The several classes of people accordingly framed to themselves the species of relief which they were to derive from the Bill: the agriculturist looked to it as a sure means of lessening the poor-rate, and of raising the price of his labour: the manufacturer looked to it as the means of again reviving the prohibition on the importation of rival manufactures from foreign lands: the merchant as a means of securing to his ships that share of employment, of which they had been deprived by the interposition of the ships of foreign nations under the new system; and the disappointment which each and all of those classes would experience in the failure of the Reform Bill to produce these expected effects, would equal the excitement which had been raised in its favour throughout the country. The people generally, also, looked forward to the attainment of the small share of political power which they would gain under the Bill as a means of personal advantage, and if such did not prove to be the case, they would wreak the effects of their disappointment on the heads of those hon. Gentlemen who had taught them to expect such results. It was, however, not the Question of Reform or no Reform which they were that evening called upon to discuss; that Question had already been decided, he was sorry to say, by the delegated authorities in that House; but with respect to the Bill before them, he was ready to admit, that if it could be shown by the Act of Union, that the people of Scotland were entitled even to a much larger measure of Reform than that, he should be very ready to grant it. He did not conceive that the Bill was such a measure of Reform as the people of Scotland had a right to expect. It seemed inconsistent with the principles of that Bill which they had already passed, and if he could establish that, he should have a right to call upon them not to satisfy themselves with a blind adherence to any measure, simply because it was the measure of the Administration of the day. He had a right to call upon the House to adopt a measure similar in principle to the English Bill; and he had a right, if he could prove that this which was before them, was contrary to the articles of the Union, to call upon the House to pass a Bill in conformity with those articles. If he could show, that this Bill was inconsistent with the other, or with the principle that hon. Members themselves were so bent upon establishing, that the people had a right to claim what they considered they wanted, and not what the Legislature might consider that they required, then this was not the Bill that should have been brought forward. If he looked to the preamble of the English Bill, and read it aright, he found it to run thus:—that all decayed and inconsiderable boroughs were to be disfranchised—that the elective franchise was to be extended to larger and more considerable towns, at present unrepresented—and the franchise, generally extended, by reducing the scale of qualification. The original object in establishing the return of Knights of the Shire was, to counteract the democratical influence which would be created in Parliament by adding to the Representation of large towns, and reducing that of inconsiderable boroughs. This latter, however, was the same principle as that applied in the English Bill. But upon what principle did Ministers act with regard to Scotland? Why, they not only did not increase the number of Scottish knights of the shire, but took away some of those which she returned already, and gave Scotland, under the new system, not Representatives of the people, but Representatives of the Barons or others holding their lands by tenure from the Crown. The power of returning thirty Members was taken from the landed interest to confer it upon the manufacturing interest. In the preamble of the Scotch Bill, the laws for returning Members to Parliament, as settled at the time of the Union, were stated to be defective; however, the laws for electing Members of Parliament, as settled at the time of the Union, were not defective, and therefore he maintained, that the preamble stated that which was not the fact. The learned Lord opposite had stated the object of this Bill; but he (Lord Loughborough) would ask him—why was it not founded on the same principle as the English Bill? In the Articles of the Union it was expressly stated, that the law relating to the civil government should be the same throughout the kingdom; and that the law relative to private right should be altered by the Parliament of Great Britain alone. Perhaps the noble Lords opposite might argue the question in this manner:—they might tell the House, that the Representation of Scotland was a matter of private right, but if it were, then the Representation of England was equally so. It was either a matter of public right, or of mere arbitrary legislation. The ten largest counties in Scotland returned in all ten Representatives. He would take no undue advantage, and therefore referred to the ten largest counties in Scotland, and on comparing these with ten counties in England, he found that the latter returned thirty-four Representatives. In Scotland the proportion which Representation bore to population was about one Member to 94,000 inhabitants. In England it was in the proportion of one Member to 64,000 odd. Now, on what principle of justice—on what principle of fairness—on what principle known to the Constitution of this country—was such gross injustice (he could call it by no other name) tolerated? It was not his intention to offer any opposition to the principle of this Bill specifically, for he must beg to enter his protest against the measure as founded on any principle whatever. He considered it contrary to all rule and practice; contrary to the Articles of the Union, and to every principle of equity and justice. He could not conclude without expressing a hope that the noble Lords opposite would not object to submit (as they had already done in the case of the English Bill) to any amelioration or alteration. He trusted the noble Lord would not forget the special nature of the various tenures by which land was held in Scotland. He assured the noble Lords, that if they objected to any alteration, they would subject the people of Scotland to a very heavy tax. Many people held their lands under Charters, and this description of tenure, taken in connexion with the rights of superiority, would be materially affected, in many cases, by the operation of this Bill, since the Bill, as it at present stood, would often be productive of great injustice. He would not, however, offer any opposition to the Motion, perceiving it would be nugatory, but would content himself with entering his protest against it, the Bill being at once unconstitutional and unnecessary; and he trusted to the generosity of the noble and learned Lord to allow of such amendments and alterations as might be found necessary.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* denied, that the question of Reform had been decided by a delegated majority, in any improper sense of those words, but by an uncorrupted and independent Parliament—independent alike in their principles and in their circumstances—independent of the Crown and of the Administration—but not of the country. He thought the noble Lord might have spared that observation, the more especially as none of those who preceded him in the discussion of that night, cast any reflection upon the decision which the majority of the House had come to on the Bill which had already passed. Judging from what he had heard of it, he should say, that there was nothing new in this Bill; but he would shortly advert to the observation which was made by the hon. member for Edinburghshire, with respect to one great change it introduced—he meant the qualification. When this measure was originally introduced, he thought that the 10*l.* qualification, or vote, being introduced, was such a species of revolution, that it was some time before his mind could be reconciled to it. He had found, however, that there was a disposition—a very proper one— to introduce into the Representation the tenantry of the country; at the same time to prevent any dangerous results arising from establishing too low a franchise in the towns. Under all the circumstances, it appeared to him that they could not hope to have an independent tenantry if the Representation were withheld from them. On this ground, and on this ground alone, he now expressed a hope that his Majesty's Ministers would not be induced to make any alteration in the qualification they had established, but that they would allow the 10*l.* qualification in counties to remain as it now was. He had always objected to there being a provision in the Bill which allowed the introduction of those who had votes in populous burghs, or other places, into counties. This Bill, he was aware, did not enable the person who voted in right of certain property in an ancient borough, or in a place which was made a borough, to vote also for the county. If it contained such a provision, he should object to the principle. It was idle to say, that there was no difference between borough and county interests. Perhaps indeed, there was not in reality; but, at all events, it was plain that it was generally considered that their respective interests were not alike. If the votes of the borough Members and the county Representatives were compared, it would be found, that they differed materially on many most important questions. There was one objection which he certainly still entertained to this Bill. He should be disposed to say, that the landed interest had not been sufficiently attended to. The existing proportions of borough and county Members ought to have been altered, it was true; but not to the immense extent in which it had been. On looking over the proposed alteration, it appeared to him that the Representation of counties in Scotland was decidedly not what it ought to be. He did not know whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite meant to bring forward any motion relative to this part of the subject; if such a motion were brought forward he should certainly vote in favour of it; at the same time, he should adhere to the proposed aggregate number of Scotch Members. The noble Lord (Loughborough) had said, that if Reform was to be given to Scotland, he wished it to be of the same description as that which had been given to England. Did the noble Lord wish, then, to reduce the 10*l.* franchise? What would be the necessary consequence of assimilating the system of Representation in Scotland to that of England? If the same system of Representation were given to Scotland as was established in England, the franchise must be reduced, in some parts of Scotland, to 40*s.* The noble Lord, he presumed, was not prepared to reduce that which was already a low-enough qualification—namely 10*l.* to 40*s.* The people of Scotland, he thought, would have been dissatisfied with the 40*s.* freeholders. In point of fact, the county Representation had been as pure as it could be; and he believed the people would not have been satisfied if they had been told, that he would give them the elective franchise, but that they should have it in this particular way. Upon these grounds, he felt it quite impossible to support any alteration of the kind which the noble Lord seemed to contemplate. The hon. member for Edinburghshire said, that he objected to the introduction of voters in towns. He (Mr. Cutlar Fergusson) also objected to the introduction of town voters, if they were of that description that they could not, of necessity, have the same interests as the other class of voters; but this he contended, that the immense population introduced into the Representation of Scotland was a population composed, in a considerable degree, of persons connected, more or less, with the landed interest. The interests of the voters in these boroughs were not in the least degree at variance with those of the land owners; on the contrary, their habits of association and connexion with the gentlemen of the neighbouring counties seemed to afford about the best counterpoise that could well be devised. He believed, therefore, that the landed interest of Scotland would still preserve that great and honourable place which he hoped and trusted it always would retain in the Representation of that country. He had already stated, that he objected to the introduction of the inhabitants of populous places into the Representation of counties. As an instance of the effect of this system he would cite the cases of Greenock and Port Glasgow; in the former Bill they were joined together—by the present measure Port Glasgow alone was taken, and some of the voters of Greenock were, in fact, disfranchised, while a large number was thrown into the county. He should, at the proper time, submit a proposition to the House upon that point. That the Scotch Members returned under the present system paid every attention to local interests he admitted, but he could not say so much for their endeavours to amend and improve the institutions of their country. Their principal use was, to swell the Ministerial majorities. When the question of the American war was under consideration, the Scotch Members voted in favour of its continuance; and that war would have been put an end to long before the protracted period of its termination, had the Scotch Members given a just and proper vote. At the same time, it would be difficult to find men more independent than the Scotch Members. He did not believe that they had sought for "jobs" a bit more than the English Members. He trusted, however, that hereafter we should have better times; not that he expected corruption in Parliament would be altogether got rid of in his lifetime; still less did he expect, that Reform would bring with it that abundance of good, and that extinction of evil, which some persons believed it would immediately produce. He was not one of those Reformers who entertained such a doctrine; on the contrary, he had always told the people that they would not derive such vast improvement as they expected from Reform. The people of Scotland, however, did not take up the question in that light—they considered themselves degraded by being shut out from the Representation of the people. The noble Lord said, that he considered the present system of Representation to be perfect; that was strange, for it was universally allowed to be defective. Could it be necessary to prove that, when powerful individuals could influence the return for a whole county, and a self-elected junta returned the Members for each borough? He believed no one would concur on this point with the noble Lord. The Representation of Scotland was universally condemned. No one would stand up for it in either House of Parliament. Even a certain noble Duke had so far acceded to the principles of plain common sense as to admit, that property ought to be, in some degree, connected with Representation. He would only add, that this measure of Reform was at no period so popular in Scotland as at present. There had been no time, from the 1st of March, 1831—on which day the noble Lord brought forward the Reform of Parliament Bill—up to the present moment, in which that spirit, that desire, that determination, so universally expressed to obtain Reform, had not continued to increase. He rejoiced that the people of Scotland were quiet and peaceable. That the feeling in favour of Reform was most determined in that country he knew and admitted; but he knew, also, that if, pending the final decision of the great question, a spirit of outrage or violence should arise, it would be put down by the same, better and yet more powerful spirit which obtained for Scotland its civil and religious liberty.

Mr. *Robert A. Dundas* did not rise to prolong the debate, but merely to enter his protest against the Bill. There could be no doubt that the Parliament was now placed in a situation very different from that in which it formerly stood. At that time the House of Peers had not agreed to the second reading of the English Reform Bill; but having now done so he concurred with his hon. friend (the member for Edinburgh) that it was quite impossible to withhold from Scotland Reform altogether; and, though he was as convinced as ever, that this measure would be destructive to the essential interests of that country—not only in a political point of view, but with respect to the manner in which titles were made to property—that if he were certain, even now, that by any means in his power, he could retard the progress of the measure, he would do so without hesitation: but as the other House of Parliament had already agreed to an extensive Reform in England, and as this House, on a former occasion, agreed to a Bill nearly similar to that, he should consider himself trespassing most unnecessarily on the time of the House, were he to offer an ineffectual and hopeless opposition.

Sir *Charles Forbes* expressed his most unqualified dissent from, and opposition to, this measure. With regard to the manner in which it had now been introduced to the notice of the House, he could not forbear expressing his astonishment. They had been told that there was no reaction; and the hon. Gentlemen opposite —trusting, no doubt, to the strength of their majority on that side of the House, had not condescended to offer any argument whatever in favour of the Bill. They had heard no sort of description of the nature or objects of the Bill, or of its probable tendency or consequences. He could not forbear from expressing his regret, that those who were able, and ought to be willing, to give a full explanation upon this subject, had not thought proper to afford it. He regretted that an hon. Gentleman, so well qualified as his hon. friend, to give an account of the probable consequences of his measure, had not done so; but he trusted that he would be induced to do it before the House came to a decision. However his Majesty's Ministers, backed by the mob, might coerce the House—however they might coerce the votes of its Members—they should not coerce him. He was well aware that his individual vote was of very little importance on this occasion to any party in the House; but it was of some importance to him that he should preserve his own consistency; and he should be ashamed of himself if he could sit in that House and allow this Bill to pass without giving it his most decided opposition. This could only be done by dividing the House upon this question. His opposition was principally directed against that part of the Bill which related to the county Representation. With regard to the boroughs, he should not oppose the principle of the Bill, although, perhaps, some of the details might require amendment. He would not trouble the House further, but he could not sit down without expressing his regret, that the hon. and learned member for Kirkcudbright should have withdrawn his opposition to this Bill, and departed from those principles with respect to it which he formerly entertained.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* said, his hon. friend had totally misunderstood him, in supposing that he had departed from any ground he ever took up on this subject. He stated to the House, that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman would bring forward a motion for increasing the number of Representatives for Scotland, he would vote in favour of such a Motion. With regard to his present vote, he would remind his hon. friend, that he had voted in favour of the second reading of the former Bill, and therefore he had not changed his opinion, by voting for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. *Hume* said, that he was as anxious to preserve his consistency as the hon. Baronet was his. The hon. Baronet, however, who had hitherto objected to the Bill entirely, now had no objection to the borough Reform. That principle comprised one-half of the Bill, and he congratulated his countrymen with the utmost sincerity on their having thus acquired the support of the hon. Baronet to the borough Reform, somewhat at the expense of the hon. Baronet's consistency. As the hon. Baronet had so far changed his opinions in the lapse of a few short months, he (Mr. Hume) did not despair of finding him altogether on the side of Reform in a short time. There was only one part of his speech on which he wished to make any observation. The hon. Member had said, that his Majesty's Ministers had been overawed by the mob; instead of the mob, he should have said the whole community. The hon. Gentleman proceeded on a mistake; he supposed that none but a limited number of the lower classes were anxious for this Bill, and therefore he opposed it. But the fact was, that it was the people of Scotland who called for this measure; for it was in vain to deny, that the people of Scotland were to a man in favour of this Bill. He would make one other remark before he sat down. It appeared to him that the hon. Gentleman did great injustice to the learned Lord, who had displayed great good sense and sound judgment in not pressing upon the House any argument to prove that Reform was wanting in Scotland. Reform had been so long required in Scotland, that no man could refuse it, except him who, for "consistency's" sake, happened to be opposed to it. In conclusion, he would only observe, that he hoped this measure would conciliate the whole of the people of Scotland: it would tend to raise them in their own estimation, and to make them even better citizens than they had hitherto been. He was satisfied that no measure was ever proposed which was hailed with greater satisfaction throughout the country than this.

Sir *George Murray* said, though he could not concur in the view of this subject that seemed to be recommended by the learned Lord, of allowing the present question to pass without discussion, he would not trespass on the time of the House at any very great length; but still he considered the question of far too much importance to his country to suffer this Bill to pass a second reading without briefly expressing his sentiments upon it. Before he proceeded further, he would beg to notice one remark which had fallen from the hon. Baronet (Sir Charles Forbes), with regard to his consistency. In his opinion, that hon. Baronet's consistency would be better consulted by his dividing on that Motion of which he (Sir George Murray) had given notice, with respect to an addition of Members to the Scotch counties, than by dividing the House on the second reading of the Bill; because it was quite clear that his hon. friend did not object to the general principle of the Bill, so far as it went to make an alteration in the system of borough Representation; and it would, perhaps, be better to pospone dividing until the particular part of the Bill to which he had alluded came before them. He concurred in the sentiment expressed by the hon. Baronet with respect to the borough Representation; and he believed that few persons connected with Scotland, or acquainted with that country, but must admit, that the borough Representation there required great alteration. It appeared the more necessary that he should be permitted to occupy some portion of the time of the House on the present occasion, because he stood in a position different from that of some of those hon. Gentlemen, of whose judgment and character he entertained the highest opinion, but from whom he differed in this respect, that he had never been at any time an uncompromising enemy of the principle of Reform: all that he had ever required had been, that the measure of Reform to be introduced should be moderate and temperate in its principle—that it should not be effected by sudden and violent changes—and that those changes in our political system should not be pushed at once to too great an extent. The chief ground of objection which he entertained to the plan of his Majesty's Government was, that the changes proposed were too extensive and too general, and too hastily to be carried into effect. He had never been able to separate in his view of it, the measure of Reform into three distinct parts, and, indeed, the whole ought to be considered as one great measure. He was convinced that great inconvenience had already arisen, and also that more would arise, in consequence of the measure having been divided into three separate parts for the three different portions of the United Kingdom. It was greatly owing to this that the measure was so extremely unjust to Scotland, and that the people of that part of the empire had not been treated in the way they had a right to expect. It was not treating Scotland and Ireland fairly, to separate their interests from those of England. In former times, when there existed three independent Legislatures, and they negotiated for the purpose of uniting into one, each did the best they could for their own interests; and in these unions the preponderance of England in wealth, power, and patronage, gave her somewhat of an undue advantage; but in the present day, England, Scotland, and Ireland, stood in a different situation. The union of Scotland with England, and the subsequent union of Ireland with Great Britain, altered the relation of the countries. They had not now separate Legislatures, adjusting separate interests, but a united Legislature, consulting together for the common interests of a United Kingdom; and, therefore, they should not legislate separately for these parts of the United Kingdom, but alike for the whole; and all parts of the United Kingdom should be treated in the same manner, and placed on the same footing with respect to any advantages which were to result from a general measure. In his opinion, what was due to one part of the United Kingdom was due to the others, and in legislating they ought not to make a distinction injurious to any part. Whatever advantage England proposed to attain by the Reform Bill, Scotland and Ireland had equal claims with England to participate in those advantages. Upon what ground had the demand been made for Reform? The excitement which had been raised, and which still prevailed on this subject, had been chiefly owing to the great number of nomination boroughs which existed in England, and also from a number of boroughs having become decayed, and having fallen below that standard which it was thought should authorize them to return two Members each to that House. The existence of this state of things had excited considerable discussion and dissatisfaction, and the consequence had been, that the House had passed a Bill to disfranchise fifty-six boroughs, which, it was contended, fell under the character of nomination boroughs; and to take away one Member each from thirty other places, besides two Members also from Weymouth. Now, the deficiency occasioned in the House, in consequence of this large disfranchisement, had been filled up by conferring the franchise on a large number of English towns, and on several English counties; but he would contend, that these seats did not belong exclusively to the people of England. The pretext for taking them away was, that they belonged, in part, very improperly, to individuals, and were, in part, superfluities. On these grounds they were made disposable for the benefit of the people by a united Parliament; and the advantage of the whole United Kingdom should be equally consulted in the allotment of them. He would contend that any deficiency that might exist in the Representation of the people, in any part of the United Kingdom, should be supplied by means of these disposable seats. By means of them, Gentlemen, connected with any distinct interest, not adequately represented, had found their way into that House, and the paucity of the Representatives for Scotland was not so much felt, as it would otherwise have been, because Gentlemen, connected with that part of the empire, were enabled, by means of these boroughs, to obtain a voice in the Legislature. The Legislature, therefore, on depriving these places of their right to return Members, should have made these seats disposable, without partiality, for all parts of the United Kingdom. In the enfranchising clauses of the measure of Reform, a direct voice in the Legislature had very properly been given to those places which, in the course of time, had risen into importance and wealth in the country, and which, from peculiar interests connected with them, appeared to require a direct share in the Representation. This principle had been applied to counties as well as towns, as regarded England, and it should have been made equally applicable to the whole United Kingdom. A due share of the disfranchised seats should have been given to all parts of the Kingdom. But how had the allotment been actually made? The whole number of seats which were to be filled up in consequence of this disfranchisement was 144. The great mass of Representation taken from these disfranchised places was still to be retained for England; for Scotland was to have only eight, and Ireland only five additional Members—a portion small, indeed, when compared with the 131 Members given to the towns and counties of England. He did not mean to say that there might not be particular circumstances which might prevent the application of the principle to the full extent in some parts of the United Kingdom; but, in point of principle, he could admit of no distinction. In regard to Scotland, he would maintain, that there existed no circumstances either to impair or to postpone her claims. Scotland should have been treated in the same manner as England, and should have had an equal proportionate share in the disposable Representation. When he compared the amount of the population of several cities and towns in Scotland with places in England to which Representatives had been assigned, he could not imagine on what ground they could be withheld from the former. Again, he had never heard any reasonable ground assigned for excluding the popular and wealthy counties of Scotland from an increased number of Members. In point of population, the claims of Scotland were undoubted; but he could mention other grounds also—the commercial wealth and enterprise of the people, their ingenuity and industry in manufactures, and their well-known and distinguished skill in agricultural pursuits. Indeed, there was no people who had a fairer claim to full Representation than the people of Scotland. No nation had improved so much during the last century, and had increased more in wealth and prosperity. He might also advance another claim, founded on the intelligence, and on the high moral and religious character of the people of that country, which was universally acknowledged. As, however, an opportunity would occur in the Committee of urging the claims of Scotland to an additional number of Representatives, he would not trespass further on the time of the House then. He must, however, say a very few words with regard to Ireland. It had been urged by some hon. Gentlemen, that Ireland was not in a condition to receive the full share in the Representation to which that country would otherwise be entitled, in consequence of the agitation which prevailed there, and of the turbulence of the people, which rendered it unsafe to give a greater share in the Representation to the people: but this turbulence could not justly be imputed to Ireland, nor made a matter of charge against the people of that country; but rather, it should be charged to the conduct of the Government. It should be recollected what a system of misgovernment had long prevailed in Ireland, and he was sorry to say that, so far from that hopeless mismanagement having been diminished by the present Government, it had, on the contrary, been greatly increased. It was the anxious wish, and the sound policy of the Government to which he had the honour to belong, to seek to remove the calamities which misgovernment had brought upon Ireland, by endeavouring to extinguish those flames of religious dissension which had burned with so much fury; but, unhappily, since the passing of that great measure which had that object in view, those religious flames had been re-lighted, and other causes of dissension had been added, which had raised so much discontent, and spread so much agitation throughout the country, that it might not be proper nor safe to extend to Ireland, immediately, that increase in the number of her Representatives, to which otherwise she would have been fairly entitled. Among the first causes of dissension which had been introduced into that country, had been the new plan which had been proposed with regard to the maintenance of the Church, and a new system of national education, which the Government had brought forward for the children of the great body of the people. Under these circumstances, it might be proper, perhaps, to defer giving more Representatives to Ireland; but nothing could be more unjust than to impute the agitation which prevailed in that country to the people, or to charge it against them as a crime, when the evils which prevailed there were mainly to be attributed to the Government itself. Let the claims of Ireland be postponed, if necessary, until that country was more fit to profit by them, but let not the doors be wholly shut against her. The same objection, however, did not apply to Scotland; and he must say, that that part of the empire had been treated with the greatest injustice. Much had been said, and many disputes had arisen, with regard to the true principles of the English Bill. It had been said, that it united the principles of enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and extension of the elective franchise. He had no objection to the disfranchisement going to the extent that it did in the English Bill; at the same time, it would have been advisable that enfranchisement should have preceded disfranchisement—for, in his opinion, this would have been the more safe mode of proceeding; for, by disfranchising first, they should have thereby avoided laying down the abstract principle, that there should be no such thing as nomination in the system. He was no uncompromising advocate of nomination, but where would this abstract principle lead to?—every borough in which there was a dominant interest would, by the application of that principle, be deprived of the right of Representation. He was aware that the noble Lord (Lord John Russell) had endeavoured to draw a line between nomination and that which he called the legitimate influence of property; but it would be found very difficult to make the distinction sufficiently understood and sufficiently respected, and by having laid down the principle of destroying all nomination in the first place, they would be speedily involved in a question as to the legitimacy of the influence of property where it had an entire preponderance. If he was not much mistaken, already, some few months ago, a petition had been presented to that House from the borough of Ripon, complaining of the undue influence which a large property in the neighbourhood gave to the owner of it in the election of Members for that borough. And since then, the right hon. Gentleman, the member for Stamford, had presented a petition from that town, nearly of a similar character, and which stated, that in consequence of the line drawn by the Commissioners for the limits of the borough, including within it a large portion of the property of a neighbouring Peer, the elective franchise would be rendered so dependant on that family as not to be worth possessing. Similar complaints would, no doubt, arise relative to the influence of other properties in other quarters, and this would become a continued source of dissension, and a ground to demand further changes. But whatever disputes might have arisen respecting the real principles of the English Bill, there could be no difficulty in making out the principle of the Scotch Bill, even from the statement of the learned Lord himself. That principle was undoubtedly subversive. The learned Lord Advocate for Scotland had stated in bringing forward his Bill, that the old political system of the country was to be wholly overturned and destroyed. He had heard hon. Gentlemen complained of for representing the English Bill as revolutionary. He was unwilling, at all times, to make use of terms which might be displeasing to any hon. Gentleman, but he believed that imputation to be true. However, he was by no means alarmed by the sound of a word, for a revolution might be productive of good, as it might also of evil, to the community. In its proper signification it merely meant a change. There was a time, and that by no means remote, when the people of this country justly gloried in the term revolution, because it marked the period of the adjustment of our Constitution upon wise and prudent principles. But the events which had more recently taken place in a neighbouring country had given a new meaning to the term, and that word was now generally used to imply a restless succession of changes productive of no permanent advantage to the State, and communicating discontent and alarm to surrounding nations. Whether, however, this Bill for Scotland were for good or evil, it was confessedly a revolution. He admitted, that there were great defects in the present political system of Scotland, but he should have been better satisfied with the changes proposed to be introduced by the learned Lord, had he adhered more than he had done to the basis on which the present system had so long rested. The extension of that basis should have had his (Sir George Murray's) full concurrence and cordial support, but its total subversion he could not but consider as a dangerous experiment. He must repeat that he had never made the least objection to altering the present system in Scotland, for any one acquainted with that country must admit that it abounded in anomalous imperfections. But such improvements might have been easily and safely introduced into the old system, as would have removed the objections to it without at once resorting to the hazardous measure of completely destroying it. He had heard the hon. and learned member for Calne contend, that a great change was a great evil; and, if he was not much mistaken, he had also heard the same opinion expressed more than once in another place by a noble and distinguished individual, with whom that learned Gentleman was politically connected, and for whose character he (Sir George Murray) had long entertained the greatest respect. He would not, however, go so far as the learned Gentleman, but he might safely assert, that a great change was always attended with a great risk. If this risk from a great change were incurred without a great probability, or almost a certainty, of deriving great and permanent advantages from it, he for one should feel himself bound to oppose it. But what had been the condition of Scotland under its present political system? No country in the world had, during the last century, advanced more rapidly and more steadily in a course of prosperity. Everything connected with that country had gone on in a progressive improvement most gratifying to witness. This improvement had not been limited to any particular branch, or to any particular portion of the country—it had diffused itself universally throughout every department of commerce, of manufacture, and of agriculture, and had spread itself over the whole surface of the country. But to what did the learned Lord attribute this extraordinary, this happy improvement of his native country? The learned Lord had said, that Scotland derived all these advantages from her good fortune in being united to a country under a better system than her own, in short from her connexion with England. But was this a satisfactory argument? Was this bad compliment of the learned Lord to his country to be received as sound doctrine, when it had been over and over again broadly asserted, that the system of Representation in England had been a system of corruption and of misgovernment for the last 150 years. Yet this had been urged by several Members connected with the Government, and had been the great argument for the measure that had been introduced by his Majesty's Ministers. How Scotland could owe the advantages she possessed to her connexion with a country in which such a defective system existed, and called so loudly for Reform, the paradoxes of the learned Lord had not satisfactorily explained. But it might be asked, what advantage was Scotland to derive from the complete abandonment of the old political system of the country? All that the learned Lord had stated amounted to this—that he promised that Scotland should become ten times more free, and ten times more prosperous; but he was sorry to say, that this did not appear to him to present a very substantial security against all those risks and dangers which must ever accompany a sudden, violent, and general alteration of the institutions of a country. With regard to the extension of Representation given to the towns in Scotland, he agreed entirely with the Bill as far as it went. It was most desirable and just to extend the right of Representation to the large towns of the country. He entirely concurred in the propriety of giving two Members to the capital, and also the same number to that great emporium of trade, the city of Glasgow. It was with the most perfect propriety also that a separate Member had been given to each of the towns of Aberdeen, Paisley, Dundee, and Greenock, and to the city of Perth. No places had juster claims to Representatives than these towns; but there were others, also, which had extremely strong claims, and, as it appeared to him, one stronger than some places in England to which Members had been given, but these Scotch towns had been passed over: he would only detain the House by mentioning the town of Inverness, which was a place of great and rising importance, and which was situated in a part of the country from which comparatively few Representatives were returned to Parliament. He trusted that, on consideration, the learned Lord would still use his influence to obtain a Representative for that town. The greatest injustice of the present measure would fall upon the agricultural interests of Scotland. This interest did not only gain nothing, but it suffered a great diminution of weight by the change which the Bill introduced. He regretted extremely that it was not proposed by Ministers to give to that interest in Scotland the additional share in the Representation to which it was most justly entitled. Great as was the industry and intelligence of the manufacturing interests in Scotland, those interests had not improved more rapidly, nor were they of greater importance than the agricultural interests of that country. Undoubtedly, the extended franchise in the counties was to be conferred on a class of persons very respectable; but it ought not to be forgotten, that a very large portion of those persons who were hereafter to vote for the county Representatives had no connexion whatever with the agricultural interests. And he greatly feared, that the number of those voters would, in some counties, completely overwhelm the agricultural interests, which undoubtedly had, at present, a predominant influence in the election of the county Members. He might be told, perhaps, that this was completely compensated by giving the right of voting to the farmers. No man could entertain a higher respect for any body of men than he did for the farmers of Scotland. A more respectable, intelligent, and excellent class of persons, a class more attached to their country, or more desirous of promoting its best interests, did not exist. He feared, however, that the arrangement which had been proposed, so far from being beneficial to the class of farmers, would turn out to be injurious to them, and would tend considerably to destroy, or at least to diminish, their independence. He had not a sufficiently accurate and extensive knowledge of the farmers of England to speak with confidence, but he believed that the great portion of the farmers of Scotland were more independent of their landlords than those of England; and he feared, if this Bill should pass in its present form, many landlords would be gradually tempted to look to attaining political influence, rather than to the well-being of the farmers, and that electioneering ambition, and strong political feelings, would lead to collision between landlord and tenant, and to arrangements affecting the distribution and the extent of farms, and the nature of leases, which might prove by no means conducive to the agricultural prosperity of the country. There was one part in the former Bill which he was happy to find, that the learned Lord had consented to strike out, in one instance at least, in the present—he alluded to that part which mutilated some of the counties. He did not see what possible advantage could be derived from that plan, and he was convinced that much mischief would result from it; he, therefore, rejoiced that it had been in part abandoned. He was happy to hear the learned Lord state, that the district of Cowall was not to be dismembered from the county of Argyle. But on what principle, or upon what pretext, was a portion of Perthshire still doomed to be disunited from that county, for the purpose of being added to two neighbouring counties? Nothing could be more unreasonable or more unjust. The immediate result would be, the placing the return of Members for these two counties under the control of certain families, for whom he entertained personally the most sincere respect; but when the people were told, that the object of this measure was to destroy nomination, to break down the power of an oligarchy, and to give greater freedom to elections, it was a gross deception to introduce a clause into the Bill, the sole result of which would be, in as far as it could be understood, to place the counties, for whose increase Perthshire was to be mutilated, under the influence of the families of Lord Abercrombie and of the hon. member for Kinross and their connexions. It was not merely his opinion, but the general opinion in Scotland, that the predominant interest already enjoyed by these two families in the two counties of Kinross and Clackmannan would be increased by the dismemberments of the county of Perth. He had not the least doubt that it was known to the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to other members of his Majesty's Government, that there was a county in the north of Scotland as completely under the influence of a patron, as were ever Gatton and Old Sarum. He did not complain of a family possessing that influence—he did not object to the fair influence of property—but when Ministers told the people of England and of Scotland, that one great object in passing the Reform Bill was to destroy nomination, and break down oligarchical influence, they ought not to dismember one county to place two others under an oligarchy of two families, and maintain in the hands of another family the absolute nomination of a county Representation. He was not opposed to the liberties of the people—God forbid; and his objection to this Bill had always been—not that it increased the liberty of the people—not that it tended to lessen influence—but that it went to concentrate power in one branch of the Legislature, which must inevitably be injurious to the liberties of the people. The great principle to which the prosperity of this country was owing, was to be found in the separation of power, and the distribution of it among the different branches of the Legislature. If, then, a measure were adopted which would concentrate power in any one quarter, the liberties of the people would be endangered, and the principle of the Constitution destroyed; and he would go so far as to say, that if all power were placed in the hands of the people, it would soon be found that this arrangement was the most disadvantageous possible for the people themselves. If an irresistible control was placed in that House—the prerogatives of the Crown infringed, and the independence of the House of Peers destroyed—and if, at the same time, that House was made wholly dependent on the varying will of the people—everything would have been done which was in the power of the Legislature towards preparing the way for the future destruction of the liberties of the people. He would only further allude to the means that had been employed to uphold and carry forward the great measure projected by his Majesty's Ministers. In the first place, the people had been deluded into the expectation of blessings which no reasonable man anticipated could possibly result from this Bill—more, indeed, than any reasonable man could expect would result from any measure whatsoever. Next, whilst under the influence of this delusion as to the consequences of the measure, the people had been industriously kept in a constant state of violent excitement, and had been unhappily led to acts of riot and of outrage, which had assumed the character, and produced the effect of intimidation, in many places. And in addition to this excitement—and to this intimidation effected by means of the delusion of the people—the Crown had been placed in such a situation that it hardly seemed to possess any longer the power of acting independently for itself; and the Crown being no longer in a condition of constitutional independence, its prerogatives were to be made use of for the destruction of the independence of another branch of the Legislature. He could only express his regret that such means should have been resorted to, and that his Majesty's Ministers should have deemed it necessary to bring forward a measure for the improvement of the Constitution of the State, founded on such principles, carried to such an extent, and formed by such means, as those which he had stated.

Mr. *Pringle* could not support the measure, because he considered it likely to be productive of great injury to the country.

Mr. *Croker* said, that while he still entertained as strong objections as ever to the whole principle of the Reform Bill, he still must admit that that principle was decided by the result which the House had come to on the second reading of the Bill. He contended that the whole character of Scotch Representation, so far as practical utility was concerned, afforded the strongest argument that could be urged against that decision. He would not now oppose what appeared to be the general feeling of the House, but would acquiesce in the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. *Cumming Bruce* protested against the Bill as uncalled for by the state of the Representation in Scotland.

Colonel *Sibthorp* wished it should go forth to the public, by means of the Press—if the Press were not sold to the Government—that the advocates of this measure presented an extraordinary disparity as compared with its opponents. He wished to know, out of a number of 658 Members, how many now sat upon that (the Ministerial) side, and upon this (the Opposition)? If the people and their Representatives knew each other's feelings on the question of Reform, the Bill would never have passed: they might bully a King, but they could not bully a subject.

Bill read a second time, and ordered to be committed to-morrow.

Roman Catholic Marriages.] Mr. Ruthven moved the Order of the Day for going into Committee on the Roman Catholic Marriages Bill.

Mr. *Crampton* would have opposed the Motion, but that he had agreed with the hon. Mover that he should be allowed to make considerable alterations in the Committee.

Sir *Robert Inglis* begged that more time might be given to the discussion of so important a measure.

Mr. *Croker* thought, that the law was so anomalous with regard to the most sacred relation of life, that it could not be suffered to remain, as at present, different in every different part of the empire.

Sir *Robert Bateson* and Mr. *Shaw* severally objected to proceeding at that period with a measure which was undoubtedly of great importance.

Mr. *Crampton* suggested that the hon. Gentleman should withdraw the Bill, and he would pledge himself to bring in a Bill next Session calculated to attain the object the hon. Member had in view, and not be liable to the serious objections to which this Bill was liable.

Committee postponed till that day six months.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Tuesday, *May* 22, 1832.

Minutes.] Petitions presented. By the Duke of Sussex, from the Isle of Sheppy, for a Representative.—By Lord Godolphin, from Wisbeach;—and by Lord Holland, from Bridgenorth,—for the Abolition of Negro Slavery.

University of Durham.] The Bishop of *Durham* moved the Second Reading of the Durham University Bill. He had been induced to postpone it from last week to this, that further time might be allowed to circulate it, and that all their Lordships might become acquainted with its objects. As he presumed that was now the case, it would be unnecessary for him to go into any lengthened details in explanation of those objects. This Bill was to empower the Dean and Chapter of Durham to appropriate a portion of their revenues, by the sale of certain leasehold property, to the endowment of a University at Durham. It was calculated that the proceeds of this property, including the expenses attending it, would amount to not less than 100,000*l.* This it was intended to vest in trust, as a permanent fund for the proposed institution, under the regulation and control of the Dean and Chapter. Such of their Lordships as were conversant with the northern counties of England, must be aware that some such institution had long been exceedingly desirable, in order to afford to the youth of the north an opportunity of obtaining an academical education at less cost and trouble than was now experienced; and this became daily more and more important from the increasing demand for education in all classes of the community throughout the kingdom. The Chapter had therefore, for some time past, had this design in contemplation, and had now determined upon carrying it into effect, should they be enabled so to do by obtaining the consent of Parliament to this Bill. No undertaking could better become persons placed in their station, and it entirely accorded with the spirit of their own statutes, which included among the objects of their attention, the encouragement of education, and the advancement of learning. To these objects the Chapter had not, indeed, hitherto been inattentive, as was specially shown by their entire support of the grammar school, and by their exhibitions for university students. But it had been reserved for the present members of the Chapter to bring forward this larger and more munificent design for the public benefit. He would also observe, that the situation and circumstances of Durham afforded many local and other advantages not to be found elsewhere for the establishment of such a university. The situation itself was peculiarly suitable, from its connexion with the other northern counties, while its ample church establishment, as well as excellent libraries, and other buildings capable of being applied to the purposes of an academical institution, afforded peculiar facilities for carrying the object into immediate effect. With respect to the plan of the intended university, a printed paper had been extensively circulated, containing a sufficient general outline to explain its character and intent. The government was to be vested in the Dean and Chapter, the Bishop being visitor. A chief officer, with the title of Warden, would be charged with the general discipline. Professors were to be appointed of divinity, ancient literature, and mathematics, with readers in law, medicine, history, and such other branches of literature or science as might be found requisite, with the usual offices of tutors and such other appointments as belonged to academical bodies. It was also intended that, besides foundation students, to be partly maintained by the college, and ordinary students admitted at their own cost to the privileges of the university, students of other descriptions might be admitted, under certain regulations, to attend public lectures of every kind, without being actual members of the university, or subject to its discipline. This would afford opportunity of much valuable instruction to many who could not otherwise obtain it. Further details still remained under the consideration of the Chapter, and ought to be left to its decision. To the principle of such a Bill he hardly conceived it possible that any serious objections could be entertained, nor that any difficulties in its several enactments (which were merely technical provisions to give it legal validity) were likely to arise which might not easily be obviated in the Committee. He was fully persuaded their Lordships would feel disposed to favour so noble a design, and give due credit to the highly respectable body from which it proceeded; which, in thus offering a valuable boon to the public, was making a great sacrifice, without any possible views of self-interest, and which would conduct it in a manner best calculated to insure its general success, and to answer all reasonable expectations. He moved the second reading of the Bill.

Lord *Durham* did not intend to oppose the Motion, but connected as he and his family were, and had been, with the county of Durham, he considered it his duty to inquire into all the particulars concerning the proposed institution; the more so, as it must necessarily affect, more or less, all the northern counties of England. He therefore must request from the right reverend Prelate, some further explanations on points, some of which the right reverend Prelate had not himself touched upon. It was his intention to propose some alterations in this Bill, of which he would take this opportunity to inform the right reverend Prelate. He had understood the right reverend Prelate to say, that the whole power of selling these lands was to remain with the Dean and Chapter; the lands were not to be put up for sale by public auction, but were to be sold by private contract, to whomever the Dean and Chapter might think fit. They might, therefore, if they pleased, sell all these lands to one person, which to him appeared highly objectionable. Some provision ought also to be made to give the present possessors the right of pre-emption, if the lands should be resold within twenty years. It was also proposed, that the produce of these sales was to be laid out in the purchase of land, the rents of which were to be applied to the support of the university. This he also thought objectionable, for Greenwich Hospital held large estates in the county of Durham, and, whatever might be the good order in which these estates were kept, and however well they were managed, the public did not derive the same advantage from them as from equal lands held by private individuals. Thus it would be also with the lands now to be disposed of, for the very circumstance of their being the property, and under the management of a public body, would at once lead to the greatest possible extravagance. The property ought therefore to be invested, so as to save the expense of management, by which means a larger sum would be available for the objects of the institution. The Dean and Chapter were to have the power of deciding upon the different branches of education which were to be carried on, and what forms and regulations were to be observed. This was a point of the utmost importance, for a majority of those persons likely to avail themselves of this opportunity of educating their sons, were Dissenters, and he would therefore ask the right reverend Prelate, whether any regulation was to be adopted for the purpose of preventing the admission of Dissenters into the institution? If that were intended, the proposed establishment would be of no benefit to the north of

England. There were at present in that part of the country, a large number of persons who wished to give their sons a college education, but who could not afford to send them to Oxford or Cambridge, and who had, from the circumstance that the two Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh were situated in large and populous towns, where the students were exposed to great temptations and irregularities, and where they were placed under no control, a decided objection to sending their children to those places. The right reverend Prelate had stated, that the sacrifice which the Dean and Chapter were about to make was very large, yet, if his information were correct, the advantage previously derived from the property in question was very small indeed. The reserved rents of the scheduled property amounted, he understood, only to 175*l.* a-year while a fine was levied every seven years: what those fines had realized was not known, for the Dean and Chapter had not informed the public, but they had been calculated by those who had taken much pains to investigate this subject at a gross amount of 7,000*l.*: the lives of the Dean and Chapter (not considering translations) being not worth more than ten years' purchase, he could not think the sacrifice very great. He regretted to take up their Lordships' time upon this subject, but it was one extremely interesting to the northern counties of England. If this institution was to be conducted on a broad and liberal principle, and to be open to all classes, without their being subjected to religious tests on entering it; if it was intended to afford them the advantages of a liberal education, the institution would be most beneficial, not only to the county of Durham, but to the northern counties at large. If, however, on the other hand, it was to be conducted on narrow principles—if all persons were to be excluded except members of the Church of England, he was convinced that but a very limited number of persons would present themselves for the purpose of receiving education in that institution. In point of fact, it would resolve itself into a mere manufactory for the lower members of the Church, for the creation of curates (a very useful branch of the Church, he would admit); but in founding an institution of this description, it ought to be done on a broad and liberal basis, and its advantages ought to be extended to that class of persons to whom he had referred. He had thought it his duty to state thus much to the right reverend Prelate, trusting that he should hear from the right reverend Prelate, that Dissenters were not to be deprived of the advantages of education in the university.

The Bishop of *Durham* said, the noble Baron could hardly expect him to go into the several particulars he had adverted to, respecting the revenues of the Chapter, their several rents, their fines, and other matters with which it could not be supposed that he (the Bishop of Durham) was well acquainted. Not being a member of the Chapter, he knew no more of these details than any of their Lordships. He should confine himself, therefore, to such points only as it might be fitting for him to notice; and if he should not state them accurately, those members of the Chapter then present would be able to set him right. The noble Baron had objected to one clause of the Bill, which seemed to leave the Chapter at liberty, should they think fit, to make over the whole property set forth in the schedule for enfranchisement, to some one great proprietor, to the detriment of the numerous lessees by whom it was now held. He had not been aware that such might be the operation of the clause; but he could assure their Lordships that no such intention had ever entered into the thoughts of the Chapter; so far from it, the lessees in South Shields had already actually petitioned the Chapter for the enfranchisement of their respective portions, and were very desirous of availing themselves of the opportunity afforded them; nor was there any reason to suppose that the Chapter had the remotest wish to act towards them injuriously in any degree. With respect to another objection stated by the noble Baron, that the Bill required the money raised by this measure to be laid out in the purchase of land, and might thus extend the landed property of the Chapter in the county of Durham, he must observe, that this mode of investment had not been optional on the part of the Dean and Chapter, who would certainly not object to its being vested in the public funds, as producing larger interest, and attended with less charge and cost. But they were advised that it was contrary to a standing rule of their Lordships to invest it in any other way than in the purchase of land; and, unless that rule were dispensed with, they had no choice left to them. Should it, however, be necessary to invest it in land, he was sure the Chapter would readily pledge themselves not to make any purchases of land in the county of Durham, beyond such as might be wanted as a site for any buildings to be erected for the college; while, on the other hand, they were diminishing their property of this description to a large amount, by this very measure. He would now advert to an objection of a different kind, strongly urged by the noble Baron, and which it was more immediately within his province to notice. The noble Baron apprehended that the proposed institution would be too exclusive in its character, not liberal enough in extending its advantages to persons who did not belong to the Established Church, and therefore likely to be of but little general utility. He had already noticed one express provision in the printed statement of the plan, which allowed persons to be admitted to public lectures in science, or literature, of whatever description, without being subject, as students, to the discipline of the university. By this regulation, many might avail themselves of very considerable advantages from the institution, subject to no previous inquiry or restriction as to their religious persuasion. With respect also to those students who were to be actually members of the university, it was intended to adopt the regulation of the University of Cambridge, which did not require tests or subscriptions at the admission of members, nor until they took degrees, or other academical privileges. Such persons, however, would necessarily become subject to the discipline of the University; and, consequently, as a part of that discipline, would be required to attend the daily service of the church. This conformity to the Church of England appeared no more than what ought to be expected, in an institution founded and supported by such a body as the Dean and Chapter. Such a rule ought not to be dispensed with, nor ought the privilege of conferring degrees, if hereafter committed to the University by charter, to be thrown open indiscriminately to non-conformists of every description, in common with members of the Established Church. Neither the Chapter nor he himself would ever concede this; and, indeed, he would rather withdraw from the concern, and decline being constituted visitor of the institution, or in any way implicated in its direction, if such a principle were adopted. If they were now coming before Parliament for a grant of public money, or if the institution were set on foot by persons of various descriptions, and various religious tenets, contributing severally and jointly to its foundation and support, then there might be some reason for thus indiscriminately extending all its privileges. But here, where so distinguished an ecclesiastical body was the sole founder of the design, and was to have the entire responsibility and direction, it was wholly inconsistent with the station of the members of the Chapter in the Church, and with the principles they were bound to uphold, that any greater latitude in these respects should be required or expected from them, than that which they had already declared it to be their intention to admit. The lesser points of objection might be more conveniently considered in Committee.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* expressed his deep sense of gratitude towards the right reverend Prelate and the Dean and Chapter, for the conduct they had pursued as regarded the founding of this university, and which was hailed by the whole county with the greatest possible satisfaction. He was not then prepared to meet the objections of the noble Baron, who had gone through the details with so much ability, or to say that there might not be some foundation for his statement: but he relied with confidence on the right reverend Prelate, that, in selecting persons to conduct the affairs of this university, the choice would fall on those who were well calculated for such a task. From his own knowledge of those persons who proposed to found this university, he was convinced that it would be conducted on those principles of religious and moral education, which they had ever felt themselves called upon to support; and he looked forward with the greatest satisfaction to the establishment proving of great benefit, not only to the county of Durham, but to all the northern counties of the kingdom.

Earl *Grey* had not been present when this matter had come under discussion, and, therefore, he could not refer to what passed upon the subject previous to his entering the House; but he did not apprehend there was any objection to the passing of this Bill. It had long been considered desirable, that an university should be founded in the county of Durham, and he had always thought, that means might best be found for carrying that object into effect by the Dean and Chapter. Taking this view of the subject, he should give his cordial support to this measure. When the subject had been brought under his notice, he had suggested two things, the adoption of which he considered might prove more advantageous to the proposed plan, and make the institution of the greatest benefit to the north of England. He understood, that his noble relative had put a question to the right reverend Prelate, as to whether the arrangements contemplated the admission of persons of all religious denominations to the benefits of this institution; and he understood his answer to be in the affirmative, that no exclusion of such persons was contemplated. As to any minor arrangements, if any objection existed, he was sure those objections would be met by that spirit of candour which had ever characterised the reverend body who promoted this Bill. Whatever imperfections there might be in it, it would, he fully expected, prove the foundation of an institution eventually of the greatest possible advantage to the Church of England. He should only state, in addition, that his Majesty gave his consent to this Bill.

Lord *Durham* said, the statement he had made was founded on the authority of persons of talent, who had given the subject their serious consideration; but, at the same time, he did not mean to say, that that statement was unanswerable. With regard to the observation of the noble Marquis, that this Bill was contemplated with general satisfaction in the county of Durham, he knew many highly respectable persons who did not entertain that opinion. He had not objected to the second reading, but had asked for explanations, that he might be enabled to understand the proposed arrangements. He should go into Committee with a view of rendering the Bill as perfect as possible, and not for the purpose of offering any vexatious opposition.

The Bishop of *St. David's* said, the noble Baron who had just resumed his seat, had stated, that the proposed measure for establishing a university at Durham was not so universally popular in the county of Durham, as the noble Marquis (Londonderry) supposed. On what grounds this statement was made he was not aware. The prospectus of the projected institution appeared in the county papers as soon as the design of establishing it was announced. A copy of it was also sent to every individual of any consideration in the county of Durham, and in the adjoining counties of Northumberland and York; and no pains were spared to circulate it as widely as possible. Nothing could be stronger or more unqualified than the terms in which every one expressed his approbation of the design; and though he had taken considerable pains to inquire into the sentiments generally entertained respecting the projected institution, yet not the slightest hint had ever reached the Chapter or himself, that dissatisfaction was felt in any quarter. As to the observation of the noble Baron, that the advantage to be derived from this institution would be of very limited extent, if it were meant to be conducted on the narrow principle of excluding all persons not professing the religion of the Church of England, he had great pleasure in being able to confirm what had been stated by the noble Earl (Grey), that arrangements had been made to enable persons of all denominations to benefit by the instruction that would be afforded at the university, and no religious test would be imposed, at the time of admission, on those who might become members of the university, but only on those on whom a degree might be afterwards conferred. The noble Baron had stated, that the majority of the inhabitants of the county of Durham were Dissenters, and this he could not allow to pass uncontradicted. It was difficult to speak with accuracy on such a subject, especially in a county of which the population was so large, and of a character so peculiarly fitted by the circumstances in which they were placed to be under the influence of the dissenting interest. But he could not allow that that interest prevailed in the county of Durham to such an extent as to warrant the assertion, that Dissenters formed the majority of the inhabitants.

Bill read a second time.

CREATION OF PEERS—THE KING'S LETTER.] The Duke of Newcastle moved an Address to his Majesty, praying that he would be graciously pleased to order to be laid on the Table of the House, a correct copy of a Letter, dated Pavilion, the 15th May, which appeared in a morning paper, and purported to be addressed by his Majesty to Earl Grey about the creation of Peers; and also copies of Circular Letters, addressed to certain noble Lords about keeping back, and staying away during the progress of the Reform Bill.

Earl *Grey* was sure that the noble Duke would, on consideration, perceive that, supposing such letters to exist, they were not documents of a nature to be laid on the Table of the House. As to the letter supposed to be addressed to him by his Majesty, he had already stated, that, as it appeared in the morning paper, it was not authentic, and supposing that a letter of that description had been sent to him by his Majesty, which he did not admit, still it must have been of a private and confidential nature, and not such a document as ought to be laid on the Table of that House. Such a paper as a private letter between the King and his Minister had never been laid on the Table of the House, and he, therefore, proposed to meet the Motion of the noble Duke by a direct negative.

The Duke of *Newcastle* thought, that the letters ought to be produced, at least the letter addressed to a distinguished member of that body in their Lordships' House, which had been honoured with the designation of "waverers," and he would take the sense of the House on the question.

Earl *Grey* hoped, that the noble Duke would perceive the impropriety of persisting in that resolution. If he did persist, he did not see how the letter, as the noble Duke read it from the morning paper, could be prevented from appearing on their journals; and he hoped that the noble Duke would see, that it was neither right nor decent, that it should do so, or that he should persevere in dividing the House on such a question.

The Duke of *Cumberland* had the greatest respect and regard for his noble friend (the Duke of Newcastle), but really, on this occasion, he must say, that his noble friend did not seem to be aware of what he was about. The letter in question, supposing that such a letter ever existed, must have been strictly private and confidential between the King and his Minister, and such an instrument was clearly not one that ought to be laid on the Table of the House. It was a kind of instrument that, even as between one gentleman and another, ought never to be produced as a public document; and, therefore, he hoped that his noble friend would not persevere in his Motion. For his own part, he had disapproved of the measure of Reform now before the House, and had conscientiously opposed it; but God forbid that he should give it a factious opposition. He did not approve of it, but he disclaimed all factious opposition.

The Duke of *Newcastle* had thought that he was justified in calling for these papers; but if the House was of opinion, that he ought not to persevere, he would consent to withdraw his Motion. His Royal Highness had disclaimed all factious opposition, and so did he; but, at the same time, he would continue to oppose this measure, and vindicate his own honour.

Motion withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND—COMMITTEE—THIRD DAY.] On the Motion of Earl Grey the House resolved itself into a Committee on the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill.

Question put, that the "Tower Hamlets" stand part of the schedule.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* considered the subject now before the House of the utmost importance, and though, from seeing all the benches near him empty, he could have no hopes of successfully opposing the present motion, yet he should act up to what he considered the strict line of his duty; and though he feared that the course he had resolved to pursue on the occasion would meet with little indulgence from some quarters, yet he would proceed, though little used to bear

> The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely.

But, disregarding what might be thought or said upon the subject, he would proceed to state as shortly as possible, the reasons why it was impossible for him to consent to insert this borough in the schedule. The Tower Hamlets stood in a situation altogether different from all other unrepresented places, and there was no one conversant with the history of popular elections—no one possessing even the most moderate acquaintance with the scenes which took place in this great metropolis, when multitudes were assembled—who would not agree with him, that any further aggravation of that evil would require a compensating benefit, which this Bill by no means afforded. But these were considerations which had no weight with its advocates; they were alike indifferent to broken heads and broken windows; and one might almost infer from the character of this clause, that they rather aimed at promoting popular excitement, than at suppressing it. This part of the Bill proceeded upon the assumption that the local interests of the metropolis were not sufficiently represented in the other House of Parliament. Nothing was more destitute of foundation in fact. Almost every Member of the House of Commons had a large interest in the metropolis, which, therefore, required no delegated Members in the House, since a large proportion of the House consisted of those who would form part of the constituency of the metropolis. He should certainly, on general principles, not be unfavourable to giving to the metropolis a large share of the Representation of the country. But, then was it the 10*l.* householders that he should desire to raise into a constituency? No; he should desire to see fairly represented the wealth, the splendor, the literature, the naval and military glory, which was concentrated in this great metropolis. The most eminent men of the nation were here collected; but were they to be found amongst the 10*l.* householders of the Tower Hamlets? The effect of this measure would be, to call into existence in the metropolis a body of electors not fewer in number than 132,000; and if the number of persons who had votes in the adjoining county, were added there would be found gathered together within those narrow limits little less than 200,000 electors. What was to be expected from such a constituency as that, excited by the frequent recurrence of the exercise of their privileges, and by the violence, the heart-burnings, and the discontent which such occasions created. What could be expected from all this, but a continuance of that agitation which had now prevailed for eighteen months past? Unless the great interests of the metropolis were truly and fairly represented, it was worse than useless thus to proceed extending still more widely the mischiefs of a low rate of suffrage—he had almost said Universal Suffrage. Was it safe as a matter even of police, to proceed in such a course as this? The history of other metropolitan places, as well as our own experience, ought to have made noble Lords aware of the dangerous tendency of this clause. Let them only recollect how revolutionary have the tendencies ever been of the constituent body in Paris. Making that place the great focus of discontent and rebellion. If their Lordships intended to establish a club-government in this country, a more effectual means of accomplishing that object could not be adopted, than passing the present clause. The orders of those clubs would then be issued to that House in the shape of petitions, and the same orders would be sent to his Majesty in the shape of addresses. They were then, in some degree, under the influence of a club-government; and the effect of this clause, he was prepared to maintain, would be to perpetuate that species of domination, and to organize, in the heart of the capital, a body of the most seditious description. Would not these persons have fresh excitement at every election—would not every election be contested—and would not the intervals occurring between elections be occupied in keeping alive that spirit which was opposed to the welfare and the well-being of a state. There was not to be found throughout the United Kingdom, a place the local interests of which were so well attended to in the House of Commons as those of the metropolis, and it must of necessity be so, even if there were fewer Representatives than London had at present. If the additional Representatives proposed by this clause were given to the metropolis, the evil of irritation would be increased and aggravated tenfold. Instead of having legislators returned to the House of Commons, formed for calm deliberation, they should have men of violent passions, elevated by the clamour of multitudes—men possessing no qualities but those which claimed distinction on the hustings. The constituents of such men would upon every remarkable occasion, surround the Houses of Parliament they and their Representatives would form a mob-government, exciting and excited—mutually and reciprocally producing a fermentation inconsistent with the freedom of Parliament, and incompatible with the existence of the monarchy. On these grounds he should recommend, either that the metropolitan qualification should be raised, or, instead of giving additional Representatives to the metropolis as such, to enlarge the Representation of Middlesex. That would give a better chance of having men of character and talent returned, and it would likewise impart to the agricultural interests of Middlesex that influence of which it had for a long time, been deprived, through the overwhelming influence of the town voters.

In fact, the Representation of Middlesex was scarcely anything else than a town Representation; and, therefore, he was earnestly desirous of seeing restored to that rich agricultural district the privilege of electing its own Members. He felt perfectly assured, that if the Members of both Houses who decided the Reform question were to be put into a room together, and called upon to vote by ballot on the question of the Tower Hamlets, it would be decided against them. Of all the propositions into which the fatal measure could be divided, there was none which he conceived to be so especially revolutionary as the present. But, in urging his opposition upon the House in its present state, he had no sanguine expectation. He had no hope of a successful resistance to those metropolitan enfranchisements. There had been a time when he had hoped, that Ministers might not have been averse to taking those views of this subject which he had laboured to impress upon their Lordships; but of that he had now no expectation; and he regretted this the more, since he must regard the clause before them as peculiarly revolutionary. Had the Bill been divested of this clause, others, as well as himself, might have been reconciled to it, but as it now stood, it was impossible that he should ever withdraw his opposition.

Lord *Durham* spoke as follows:* My Lords, I confess, that I cannot join with the noble Earl (Carnarvon) in his lamentations over the present state of the House, and as little can I concur with that noble Earl in the view which he takes of the Bill now under the consideration of your Lordships. The noble Earl has spoken of the Vote by Ballot, and seems to recommend it as the only effectual means of ascertaining the true sentiments of the Members of this House on this particular clause. The merits or demerits of that system I cannot now discuss; but I own, it does appear to me rather a novelty to hear the noble Earl opposite, of all persons, declaring himself the advocate of Vote by Ballot. With respect to the general declamation that has fallen from the noble Earl, I do not think it will be necessary for me to trouble your Lordships with many remarks; but I do hope, that in our future discussions we shall proceed in a more becoming tone and temper to deal with the measure before us. I trust that we shall proceed with it calmly and deliberately, and that there will now be an end to everything like heat or party animosity on either side. I take for granted, that the House will excuse me from entering now upon any defence, either on my own behalf or on that of my colleagues, relative to our general conduct on the Reform Bill, and that you will not expect from me any vindication from the charges brought against us, not now for the first time. As for the principle of the Bill, as applied to the enfranchisement of great towns, I understand it to be that of population, to which are added all the various considerations arising out of commerce, manufactures, wealth, and the payment of assessed taxes. Now, as those principles form the basis of enfranchisement, I will say, that there are no parts of the kingdom better entitled to send Representatives to the other House of Parliament than the metropolitan districts. But the noble Earl has contended, that conferring the elective franchise upon them will have the effect of continuing and increasing agitation, and promoting tumultuous and disorderly assemblages. He seems to think that every meeting of electors must necessarily end in broken heads and broken windows. I, on the contrary, am prepared to show, by a reference to the history of Representation, that the violence consequent upon popular excitement is in the inverse ratio of Representation; that is, it diminishes in proportion as the inhabitants are admitted to the free exercise of their franchise. Nor need I go far, either in point of time or place, for a proof. The noble Earl may have seen, at all events heard of, the large assemblies which have within the last few days met, and expressed strong opinions, in Mary-le-bone and the other unrepresented districts of the metropolis, but he has neither seen nor heard of any such proceedings in Westminster. There was a meeting of the electors of Westminster, it was true, but it was confined to a comparatively few, and was peaceable in its demeanour—why? simply because Westminster was faithfully represented. There was no lack of zeal on the part of its inhabitants—quite the contrary; but their calmness amid the stirring scene around them was—

> ———"the supreme of power,
> 'Twas might reposing on its own right arm"—

---

* Reprinted from the corrected Speech, published by Ridgway.

the arm of Representation. If your Lordships look at the places throughout the country most distinguished in the annals of popular violence, you will invariably find, that the violence was greatest where the Representation was either altogether not in existence, or most imperfect. In London there has been no riot worth mentioning since the riots of 1780, which were produced by Lord George Gordon. [A *Noble Lord*:—The Corn-law riots in 1812.] In that instance there was no destruction of life on the part of the people, but little of property, and no furious and ungovernable attack upon either. Facts—experience—then, demonstrate that the evils of popular excitement and large assemblies diminish in proportion as the people are admitted to a participation of political rights—in proportion as they are invested with a constitutional motive for avoiding every proceeding calculated to endanger the public peace.

The next consideration in favour of the present clause is, that it is in perfect harmony not only with the progress of Representation in England, but with every species of Reform which has of late years been submitted to Parliament. In proposing to extend the franchise to the metropolitan districts, Ministers are but following that ordinary course of Representation which has always been applied to the metropolis. London was first enfranchised in the 49th of Henry 3rd, at which time Westminster was a very inconsiderable village. As it increased in wealth and population, it received the right of returning Representatives (1 Edward 1st, c. 6), as did Southwark afterwards, although the precise period at which that borough was enfranchised is not known. The principle, therefore, of the gradual enfranchisement of the suburbs of the metropolis as they increased in wealth, population, and intelligence, was that upon which our ancestors proceeded, and is that on which the promoters of the present Bill earnestly wish the Legislature of the present day to act. And here I cannot help calling your attention to the fact, that there has not been, in the whole list of Parliamentary Reformers, found one who ever contemplated a measure of Reform which did not embrace the enfranchisement of the metropolitan districts. Both the plans of Mr. Pitt, in 1783 and 1785, had that object in view.

In 1783 there were four petitions praying for Reform presented to the House of Commons, previous to Mr. Pitt bringing on his motion. The first petition was from Kent; the second from the freeholders of the City of London; the third from the inhabitants of Westminster; and the fourth proceeded from that quarter which is the great object of alarm to noble Lords opposite—the Tower Hamlets. In 1785 Mr. Pitt proposed, 'That seventy-'two Members should be divided between 'the Counties and the Metropolis, as 'nothing could be more evident than that 'the Cities of London and Westminster 'had a very inadequate share of the Re-'presentation of the kingdom.'* In the explanation of Mr. Pitt's plan, by the Rev. Mr. Wyvill, with whom he conferred, are further details, in which we find, that the household suffrage was to have been given 'to the inhabitants of Pancras, Mary-le-'bone, and other unrepresented parts of 'the Metropolis.' Thus Mr. Pitt's plan gave, evidently, more Members to the Metropolis than we do. We give an addition only of eight; he an addition which, though not actually specified in numbers, must have been larger—when he says seventy-two should be "divided" between the Counties and the Metropolis. It is clear, therefore, that our plan is not so extensive even as that of a Reformer whose principles the noble Lords profess to revere, and who, be it recollected, proposed this great addition to the metropolitan Members, at a time when the wealth and population of London was much inferior to what it is at the present time. How much it has gradually but certainly increased in both these particulars, your Lordships will be surprised to hear. In the year 1377, the population of London amounted to 35,000; in 1700, to 674,000; and, at the present moment, it amounts, exclusive of seamen and strangers, to 1,474,000. Now the population of the whole of Great Britain is 16,537,000: it therefore naturally follows, that the Metropolis contains one-eleventh part of the whole population of Great Britain. If, then, population alone were taken as the basis of the Bill, London ought to return one-eleventh part of the Representatives of Great Britain, whereas it will, as at present arranged, return only sixteen out of 553, or one-thirty-fourth part of the whole.

---

*See Hansard's Parl. Hist. vol. xxv. p. 448.

With reference to wealth, my Lords, if that be taken as the criterion of Representation, the case will be still stronger. There are fewer poor in the county of Middlesex, in comparison to its population, than in any other densely-peopled district in the world. From accounts laid before Parliament, it appears that the sum expended for the maintenance of the poor in Middlesex, in the year ending March, 1831, was 681,567*l.*, which, as the population of Middlesex is 1,358,200 is a charge of 10*s.* a-head—a low rate, when it is recollected how much more the maintenance of the poor must cost in the Metropolis, from the greater dearness of the articles required for their subsistence, than in the agricultural districts, and how much more liberally they are provided for. This will be evident from comparing it with that of other counties, and more particularly of those which are chiefly agricultural. In Norfolk, which contains a population of 390,054, the poor-rates amount to 299,357*l.* that is, 15*s.* 6*d.* a-head. In Suffolk, with a population of 296,304, the poor-rates are 270,651*l.*, or 18*s.* a-head, both much higher, positively and relatively, than the 10*s.* rate of Middlesex. The same contrast may be shown with most of the other counties.

Now as to trade; does the House know what proportion the mercantile navy of London bears to the shipping of the whole kingdom? In 1829, the whole mercantile navy of Great Britain and Ireland amounted to 19,110 ships, the tonnage of which was 2,199,959; of this number 2,663, with a tonnage of 572,835, belonged to London—about one-seventh part of the shipping, and, owing to the size of the ships being above the average, one-fourth of the total tonnage of the empire.

The next point to which I think it necessary to direct the attention of your Lordships is, the amount of the pecuniary contributions to the necessities of the State by this City; and if this point be examined, it will be found, that the preponderance in favour of its importance and station is still stronger. In 1829, the gross Customs' revenue collected in the Port of London amounted to 10,211,000*l.*; the rest of Great Britain and Ireland contributing 8,685,000*l.*—twenty per cent more than that of all the other ports of Great Britain, and more than six times that of the total Customs' revenue of Ireland. If, therefore, we take the question of Representation as affecting that commerce to which the nation is so largely indebted for its wealth, power, and glory, I ask your Lordships, has this Bill done too much, or has it done enough, when it allows London, whose Customs' revenue exceeds 10,000,000*l.*, but sixteen Members; while Ireland, which only contributes to the public revenue 1,700,000*l.*, is to have 105 Members? The duties on exciseable articles paid in London are proportionally great, but cannot be so accurately measured: the consumption of tea, malt liquors, and British spirits is immense; but, on the whole, if the number of Representatives to be given to any place were to be proportioned to the sums paid to the State, London would not merely return sixteen, but 200 Members. I, therefore, think that the noble Lord cannot now, with any propriety, persist in saying, that we have given it too many Members in assigning to it eight additional ones by this Bill.

There is another criterion which we ought also to consider—its general character and intelligence. That point the noble Earl himself does not dispute; he agrees that the character and intelligence of this Metropolis should be represented; but he does not tell us how he would effect that, and to what class of voters he would assign the Representation of that intelligence. [The Earl of *Carnarvon*: Additional county Representatives, I said.] It seems, then, that the noble Earl intends that the 40*s.* freeholders only should be the representatives of that intelligence; but why, I ask, should we exclude householders? I contend that freeholders are not exclusively that class in which is to be found alone the intelligence of society; and of the truth of this assertion London furnishes me the strongest instance. In no quarter of England—in no city in the world—is there so much intelligence, so great a desire for information, as in the middle class of its inhabitants. The best mode of ascertaining this is, by observing the demand which exists for books. It is estimated that, of the whole number published in England, one-third are sold in London; also, with reference to the newspapers—of those published here—from two-thirds to three-fourths are read, and one half retained, in London.

My Lords, I mention these facts because

I consider the desire for reading books, for entering into the investigation of learned and scientific subjects, and the habit of reading and discussing matters of public interest, to be not an unfair criterion of the state of education in this or any other city. In no other town in the world are there so many literary and philosophical societies, so well attended, and at which lectures are delivered which would do honour to the most scientific Professors of Oxford or Cambridge. There is one of these which I will especially mention—one, of the existence of which I know not whether noble Lords are aware—I mean the Institution in Aldersgate-street, which is entirely supported by tradesmen and clerks in counting-houses. I have never visited it myself, but, from the information which I have received from those who have, I learn that the lectures are of the first description. Now these persons, and others of a similar character would, by the plan of the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), be totally excluded from any participation in the benefits of the elective franchise, which even he admits ought to be the means of representing the intelligence of London, of which they furnish the most convincing proofs.

Here I must remark, that the result of all the noble Earl's arguments, or rather assertions, is to prove, that the constituency to be given to the Metropolis by this Bill will be composed of dangerous persons, hostile to the existing institutions of the country. Now, I have already said, that in no city in Great Britain have there been so few riots as in London. Let the noble Earl only reflect on all the circumstances which have marked the excitement of the past week, during which such numerous meetings have been held both in and about the Metropolis, at which the speakers have expressed themselves with the greatest boldness, and occasionally with great violence—and yet he cannot say, that there has been the slightest attempt to commit outrages against either person or property. In fact, my Lords, what is called the mob bears a very small proportion in London to the mass of the population, which consists of tradesmen and shopkeepers interested in the preservation of that good order which is so essential to their prosperity. As a proof of this, I may mention the fact, that 85,000 dividend warrants are regularly issued to persons drawing not more than 5*l.* of dividend from the funds; of these, no fewer than 70,000 belong to persons resident in the Metropolis. I ask your Lordships—is not this a most important fact? Does it not conclusively prove what a large mass of the middle classes is interested in the support of that very species of property, which is supposed to be the first object of attack from those demagogues and agitators whom the noble Earl is eternally denouncing? Is it likely that a class of persons so interested in, and dependent on, the permanence of the existing institutions of the country, will countenance any measure calculated to destroy them, or that they will ever vote for candidates hostile to public faith and the security of property?

Thus far, my Lords, I have only gone through the arguments upon the general question of the metropolitan Representation; but I do not wish to confine myself to generalities—I intend to enter into a consideration of each of these districts separately. I have, I can assure your Lordships, after the most attentive investigation, not the slightest apprehension of any danger arising from the Representation which may be granted them; on the contrary, I am persuaded that your Lordships will, when you have heard the state of these districts, agree with me in thinking, that they are much more likely to return men of great commercial importance than even any others of the great towns in the country now about to be enfranchised.

With respect to Mary-le-bone, I need not urge anything as to the wealth, respectability, and intelligence of that district, as it is well known to all who hear me. It contains the parishes of Mary-le-bone, Pancras, and Paddington. Finsbury contains the parishes of St. George, St. Luke, St. Giles, St. George, Bloomsbury, and St. James and St. John, Clerkenwell—several large squares inhabited by wealthy individuals, several Inns of Court—Gray's Inn, Lincoln's Inn, Furnival's Inn, and the Charter House; it also contains that great literary society, the London Institution, together with the British Museum. Lambeth includes the parishes of Christchurch, St. Giles, Camberwell, St. Mary, Newington, and Christchurch, Surrey. It is true, that in this borough there are a considerable number of small houses, but there are also a large number of second-rate houses built, within the last thirty years, inhabited by respectable and intelligent persons. It contains large glass-works and factories, one especially—I mean that of Messrs. Maudslay, which cost 200,000*l.*, and in which are employed a great number of workmen of the most industrious and respectable description.

I now come to that district, the enfranchisement of which, to my astonishment and surprise, has created more alarm and more feelings of apprehension than any other portion of this Bill—I mean the Tower Hamlets. It really appears to me that noble Lords are accustomed to take their notions of the Tower Hamlets from what they may have seen of them when embarking at the Tower Stairs to proceed on a voyage to Ramsgate, Margate, or the continent. My Lords, that small portion of it undoubtedly does not present a very splendid appearance—but that spot does not constitute the Tower Hamlets—far from it—for in that district there are the parishes of St. Matthew, Bethnal-green, St. Leonard, Shoreditch, St. Mary, Whitechapel, St. Paul, Shadwell, St. Ann, Limehouse, Blackwall, Mile End Old Town, Ratcliffe, &c. The Liberty of the Tower has also peculiar privileges and jurisdiction—a Court-house of its own, and a separate Court of Requests—and is, in fact, almost a separate county. Comprised within its limits are the Tower, the Trinity House, the Mint, the London Docks, the St. Katharine Docks, several of the East-India warehouses—nearly all the large sugar-houses, large cooperages, shipbuilding-yards, two great manufactories of chain cables, glass manufactories, founderies, and, lastly, the great silk manufactory, which works, probably, a million of pounds weight of silk yearly. The wealth of the Tower Hamlet district is hardly computable —so great, indeed, is it, that if the value of the Docks and the East-India Company's warehouses, which alone cover almost as much ground as many of the great towns in England, is fairly estimated, with other kinds of property, it will be found to contain twice as much wealth as any other of the metropolitan boroughs, or even of the City itself. I must confess that if I am to predict what will be the species of Representatives returned by the Tower Hamlets, I should say that, so far from their being persons of no consideration, they are much more likely to be too closely connected with these great establishments. My impression is, that the Directors of the East-India and Dock Companies will necessarily possess and exercise a great and important influence in the election of Members of Parliament under this Bill; and if this influence is ever converted into a positive control, I shall regret it as a great evil. I consider that the great object to be attained in fixing the elective franchise ought to be the independence of the elector; that being secured, I care not how low it descends. It is on this principle that I have ever objected to Universal Suffrage, because I contend, that it is absolutely certain that the workmen and labourers who would then be entitled to vote, cannot be free agents, but must always be under the absolute control of their masters, on whom they are dependent for their daily pay and sustenance.

I will now state to your Lordships a few facts, for the purpose of establishing a comparison between the four metropolitan districts and other boroughs in the country, as to population, houses, assessed taxes, and 10*l.* houses. I will commence with the four greatest and most populous. The population of the metropolitan districts is 916,265—the united population of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and Sheffield, amounts to only 543,273. The number of houses in the metropolitan districts is 144,279; the number contained in the four above-mentioned boroughs is 116,373. The number of houses of the annual value of 10*l.* in the former, is 84,488—namely, 23,266 in Finsbury; 21,630 in Mary-le bone; 23,187 in the Tower Hamlets, and 16,405 in Lambeth—in the latter only 30,939. As to the number of these metropolitan electors, I must observe, that any noble Lord who examines the clause conferring the 10*l.* franchise, will find, that the restrictions are so great as to residence, payment of rates and assessed taxes, and registration, as to preclude from the exercise of the right of voting many persons who are nominally entitled to it. In fact, one-fourth must always be subtracted from the apparent number. The difference in point of assessed taxes paid by these places respectively is still more remarkable; the four metropolitan districts paying the sum of 667,648*l.*; while the amount contributed by the four great towns in question is only 100,384*l.* It will thus be seen, that the population of the metropolitan districts is nearly double the amount of that of the four boroughs alluded to—that there are 27,906 more houses—three times as many houses of the annual value of 10*l.* and upwards—and that the amount of assessed taxes is considerably more than six times as great. After this, can it be seriously contended that the metropolitan districts are undeserving the limited share of Representation which has been allotted them*? I will now compare them in the same respects with all the other new boroughs to be enfranchised on the same points. The population of the whole forty-two is 2,494,435; the number of houses, 434,274; the houses worth annually 10*l.* and upwards, 158,434; and the amount of assessed taxes, 962,152*l.* Of these numbers, the metropolitan districts contain, in population, 916,265—houses, 144,279—10*l.* houses, 84,488—and pay in assessed taxes 667,648*l.*; that is, more than one-third of the population—nearly the third of the

No. I.—LIST OF ALL THE NEW BOROUGHS IN ENGLAND AND WALES,

The Counties in which each of them is situate,—the number of Members each is to return—Population—Houses—Houses of the Annual Value of £10 *and upwards, and the amount of Assessed Taxes paid in each Borough, in* 1831.

	Boroughs.	Counties.	Members.	Population. 1831.	Total Houses.	Houses worth annually £10 and upwards.	Assessed Taxes, 1831.
							£.
1	Macclesfield	Chester	Two	30,000	6,000	1,100	2,500
2	Stockport		Two	41,000	7,600	1,500	4,000
3	Whitehaven	Cumberland	One	15,700	3,000	900	2,000
4	Devonport	Devon	Two	44,000	4,600	3,000	9,700
5	Gateshead	Durham	One	15,300	2,300	750	2,006
6	South Shields		One	18,756	3,194	838	1,627
7	Sunderland		Two	40,735	5,292	2,528	1,756
8	Merthyr Tydvil	Glamorgan	One	22,083	4,365	....	1,588
9	Cheltenham	Gloucester	One	22,942	4,349	2,067	21,185
10	Stroud		Two	41,000	9,300	1,600	7,244
11	Chatham	Kent	One	19,000	3,500	1,174	3,500
12	Greenwich		Two	63,172	12,053	6,000	22,454
13	Blackburn	Lancaster	Two	27,091	4,802	625	2,326
14	Ashton		One	14,673	2,926	612	1,435
15	Bolton		Two	42,395	7,632	1,612	4,315
16	Bury		One	19,140	3,497	763	2,400
17	Manchester		Two	187,022	32,034	12,723	40,628
18	Oldham		Two	32,381	6,192	1,128	1,990
19	Rochdale		One	20,156	3,152	1,014	3,143
20	Salford		One	52,366	9,586	1,286	8,970
21	Warrington		One	18,184	3,798	973	3,051
22	Finsbury	Middlesex	Two	224,839	29,605	23,266	201,027
23	Mary-le-bone		Two	234,294	27,818	21,630	282,201
24	Tower Hamlets		Two	302,519	66,777	23,187	93,151
25	Lambeth	Surrey	Two	154,613	20,079	16,405	90,069
26	Tynemouth	Northumberland	One	20,201	3,500	1,151	2,776
27	Froome	Somerset	One	11,000	2,474	400	1,960
28	Stoke on Trent	Stafford	Two	53,000	9,000	1,500	4,900
29	Wolverhampton		Two	67,000	14,000	2,400	5,000
30	Walsall		One	15,030	3,000	800	1,730
31	Brighton	Sussex	Two	41,994	8,885	....	35,580
32	Birmingham	Warwick	Two	142,201	38,000	7,000	28,351
33	Kendall	Westmorland	One	11,577	2,207	682	3,088
34	Dudley	Worcester	One	23,143	4,700	800	2,537
35	Kidderminster		One	16,000	3,100	500	2,052
36	Whitby	Yorkshire	One	10,399	2,051	500	2,036
37	Bradford		Two	34,688	6,394	1,624	2,303
38	Halifax		Two	31,317	6,487	1,330	4,117
39	Huddersfield		One	19,035	3,836	1,140	3,031
40	Leeds		Two	123,393	26,787	6,833	18,800
41	Sheffield		Two	90,657	19,552	4,383	12,605
42	Wakefield		One	12,500	2,800	800	6,000
			64	2,494,435	434,274	158,434	962,152

number of houses—more than one-half of the number of qualifying tenements of those forty-two boroughs—and pay a sum of assessed taxes equal to considerably more than two-thirds of that contributed by the whole; yet the thirty-eight other boroughs will have fifty-six Members, and the metropolitian districts only eight. I have other calculations, with which I have been furnished by those most competent to make them, in which these districts are compared in the same particulars with all the boroughs in England and Wales, as to the amount of poor-rates, window-duties, county-rates, church-rates, and a variety of other tests. I fear to weary your Lordships by reading them, but they still more strongly and incontrovertibly establish

No. II.—*Comparison of the Four New Metropolitan Boroughs with the Four most Populous Boroughs not Metropolitan.*

The Four New Metropolitan Boroughs.	Population.	Houses.	£ 10 Houses and upwards.	Assessed Taxes.
				£.
Mary-le-bone	234,294	27,818	21,630	282,201
Finsbury	224,839	29,605	23,266	201,227
Tower Hamlets	302,519	66,777	23,187	93,151
Lambeth	154,613	20,079	16,405	91,069
Totals	916,265	144,279	84,488	667,648
Four most populous Boroughs not Metropolitan.				£.
Manchester	187,022	32,034	12,723	40,628
Birmingham	142,201	38,000	7,000	28,351
Leeds	123,393	26,787	6,833	18,800
Sheffield	90,657	19,552	4,383	12,605
Totals	543,273	116,373	30,939	100,384

Thus it appears, that the Four Metropolitan New Boroughs are to the Four most populous New Boroughs not Metropolitan as follows:

In Population nearly double.

In respect to Houses as 144 to 116.

In respect to Houses of 10*l.* and upwards Annual Value, nearly treble.

And they pay in Assessed Taxes more than 6½ times as much money.

The Tower Hamlets and Lambeth pay nearly as much in Assessed Taxes as the whole of the Four most populous New Boroughs not Metropolitan.

Finsbury pays twice as much, and Mary-le-bone pays nearly three times as much as the Four most populous Boroughs not Metropolitan.

No. III.—*Comparison of the Four New Metropolitan Boroughs with the whole of the Forty-two New Boroughs.*

	Population.	Houses.	£ 10 Houses and upwards.	Assessed Taxes.
				£.
Totals of the 42 Boroughs	2,494,435	434,274	158,434	962,152
Totals of the 4 Metropolitan	916,265	144,279	84,488	667,448
Totals of the 38 not Metropolitan	1,578,170	289,995	73,946	294,704

Thus it appears that the Four Metropolitan Boroughs contain of the Population more than four-sevenths of an amount equal to all the other 38 Boroughs.

Houses, very nearly half as many as the 38 Boroughs.

Houses 10*l.* and upwards, 10,542 more than all the 38 Boroughs.

Assessed Taxes, twice the sum, and 78,040*l.* more than twice the sum paid by all the 38 Boroughs.

the pre-eminent claims of the metropolitan districts to a large share of the Representation. An abstract of them, however, I will shortly give: they prove that the four metropolitan districts stand the four highest in point of amount of assessed taxes, and number of houses of the annual value of 10*l.* and upwards, as well as according to the calculations of Lieutenant Drummond; and first, second, third, and fifth, as to population.

Before I sit down, I must be allowed

The 42 New Boroughs will return 64 Members, thus:

22 New Boroughs, each 2	44	
20 New Boroughs, each 1	20	64
The 4 New Metropolitan Boroughs, 2 each		8
The 38 New Boroughs not Metropolitan will return		56

If, then, the 38 New Boroughs not Metropolitan have 56 Members, the Four New Metropolitan Boroughs should have,

For Population	32	instead of eight.
Houses	27	
Houses worth 10*l.* and upwards	64	
Assessed Taxes	126	

No. IV.—*Comparison of the Metropolitan Boroughs with the whole of the Boroughs in England and Wales which are to send Members to Parliament.*

		Population.	Houses.	£ 10 Houses and upwards.	Assessed Taxes.
					£.
The Four New Metropolitan Boroughs		916,265	144,279	84,488	667,448
London City		122,395	17,315	14,564	205,476
Westminster City and Liberty		202,460	21,893	17,681	303,421
Southwark		134,147	22,482	9,923	51,262
Totals of the 7 Metropolitan Boroughs		1,375,267	205,969	126,656	1,227,607
					£.
Totals of all the Boroughs in England and Wales which are to send Members to the House of Commons	193	4,748,809	999,965	332,510	2,084,105
Totals of the Metropolitan Boroughs	7	1,374,967	205,969	126,656	1,227,607
Totals of all the Boroughs, omitting the 7 Metropolitan Boroughs	186	3,373,842	793,996	205,854	856,498

Thus it appears that the Seven Metropolitan Boroughs are to all the other Boroughs in England and Wales, in number 186, as follows—*viz.*

In Population, two-fifths.
In Houses, more than one-fourth.
In Houses of 10*l.* and upwards, considerably more than half.
In Assessed Taxes they pay as much, and nearly half as much more, as the whole 186 Boroughs: in other words, 371,109*l.* *more* than all the other Boroughs in England and Wales.

Of the 186 Boroughs, 166 will return each two Members	332
20 will return each one Member	20
Total Members returned by the 186 Boroughs	352
The Seven Metropolitan Boroughs will return	16

If then the 186 Boroughs have 352 Members, the Seven Metropolitan Boroughs should have—for

Population	143	instead of 16.
Houses	91	
Houses of 10*l.* and upwards	216	
Assessed Taxes	504	

again to advert to what the noble Earl (Carnarvon) has said, as to the effects which may be apprehended from this measure, in consequence of the character and description of the Members which he fears will be returned by the new electors. My Lords, I think those fears unfounded—wherever the people really have the power of choosing, they always return the most respectable and the best qualified Representatives. Wherever drunkenness, bribery, and electioneering debauchery, or intimidation prevail, there the worst description of voters is to be found—there the alternative is, either the nominee of the rich man who bribes and corrupts the electors, or the temporary leader of an emancipated rabble, enjoying the saturn-

---

No. V.—*Comparison of the Metropolitan Boroughs with the whole of England and Wales in respect to Houses assessed to the*

WINDOW DUTY.

The number of Houses in England and Wales assessed to the Window Duty, is	344,495
The number of Houses assessed in the Metropolitan Boroughs, is upwards of	100,000
The number of Houses assessed which are not in the Metropolitan Boroughs, is	244,495

Thus it appears that the Seven Metropolitan Boroughs contain nearly one-third of all the Houses in England and Wales assessed to the Window Duty, and more than two-fifths of a number equal to all the Houses in England and Wales not included in the Metropolitan Boroughs.

No. VI.—*Comparison of the Two Metropolitan Counties with the whole of England and Wales in respect to*—1. *Poor Relief*—2. *Highway Rates*—3. *County Rates*—4. *Church Rates*—5. *Dwelling Houses*—6. *Extent of Land in Square Miles.*

N.B. The Two Metropolitan Counties have been selected in consequence of the difficulty and uncertainty of obtaining accurate accounts from each of the Seven Metropolitan Boroughs.

1. POOR RELIEF.

			£.
The whole Sum expended for the Relief of the Poor in England and Wales on an average of several late years, is			6,431,640
Middlesex pays	£612,148	The Two Counties	853,731
Surrey	241,583		
		The 50 Counties	5,577,909

Thus the Two Metropolitan Counties pay more than one-eighth of the whole sum actually expended for the Relief of the Poor in the 52 Counties; and more than one-seventh of the sum paid by the 50 Counties not Metropolitan.

2. HIGHWAY RATES.

			£.
The 52 Counties pay			1,121,834
Middlesex	£34,246	The Two Counties	68,332
Surrey	34,086		
		The 50 Counties	1,053,502

Thus the Two Metropolitan Counties pay more than one-sixteenth of the sum levied in the 52 Counties, besides the sum paid for Paving, Cleansing and Lighting in the Metropolis—a sum which must exceed that for Highway Rates paid by the 52 Counties.

3. COUNTY RATES.

			£.
The 52 Counties pay			763,836
Middlesex	£46,717	The Two Counties	71,703
Surrey	24,986		
		The 50 Counties	692,133

Thus the Two Metropolitan Counties pay the 9½ part of the sum levied in the 52 Counties, and nearly one-ninth of the sum levied in the 50 Counties not Metropolitan, besides the enormous sum levied in the Metropolis for similar purposes.

lia of their momentary freedom with all the recklessness and ignorance of slaves. Whenever they are cheated and tricked, they return persons of the worst character; but when they have the power of choosing freely, and it is permanently secured to them, they exercise it wisely and discreetly. If we are to believe noble Lords opposite, the object of the lower classes of the people of this country is nothing but the destruction of property, and the annihilation of the privileges of their superiors. My Lords, I have no such distrust of my countrymen; I believe them to be actuated by no such dishonourable and bad motives. I believe them, undoubtedly, to be anxious to acquire that share of the constitutional privileges enjoyed by others to which

---

4. CHURCH RATES.

			£.
The 52 Counties pay			564,388
Middlesex	£ 94,559	The Two Counties	125,156
Surrey	30,597		
		The 50 Counties	439,232

Thus the Two Metropolitan Counties pay considerably more than one-sixth of the sum levied in the 52 Counties, and considerably more than one-fourth of the sum levied in the 50 Counties not Metropolitan.

5. DWELLING HOUSES.

Poor and County Rates levied solely on Dwelling-Houses.

			£.
In the 52 Counties			1,814,228
In Middlesex	£ 509,365	In the Two Counties	653,429
In Surrey	144,064		
		In the 50 Counties	1,160,799

Thus the Two Metropolitan Counties pay nearly two-fifths of the sum levied on the 52 Counties, and considerable more than half the sum levied on the 50 Counties not Metropolitan.

6. EXTENT OF LAND IN SQUARE MILES.

The area of England and Wales is, in Square Miles		57,960
The area of Middlesex is	282	1,040
The area of Surrey	758	

So that the area on which the sums above stated are levied is less than the fifty-fifth part England and Wales.

No. VII.—*General description of each of the Four New Metropolitan Boroughs.*

1. MARY-LE-BONE BOROUGH.

THIS Borough lies North and North-west of the City and Liberty of Westminster. It contains—

1. The Parish of Mary-le-bone.—2. The Parish of Paddington.—3. The Parish of Pancras.

This Borough contains a great number of wealthy inhabitants, and therefore a larger proportion of private houses than any of the other New Metropolitan Boroughs, and pays by far the largest amount of Assessed Taxes. It also contains a considerable number of houses kept by tradesmen. It is, however, a remarkable circumstance, that with a Population exceeding the Finsbury Borough by 9,455, it has 1,767 Houses less than the Finsbury Borough, and 1,636 Houses of 10*l.* and upwards of annual value less than the Finsbury Borough.

2. FINSBURY BOROUGH.

This Borough lies North partly of the City of London and partly of the City and Liberty of Westminster, and East of the New Borough of Mary-le-bone. It contains the

Parish of St. Luke,—St. George the Martyr,—St. Giles in the Fields,—St. George Bloomsbury,—St. Mary, Stoke Newington,—St. Mary, Islington.

Liberties or Places of Saffron Hill,—Hatton Garden,—Ely Rents,—Ely Place,—The Rolls,—Glass House Yard,—The Charter House,—Lincoln's Inn,—Gray's Inn.

Part of the Parish of St. James and St. John, Clerkenwell,—St. Sepulchre,—St. Andrew, Holborn,

Part of Furnival's Inn, Staple's Inn, which are situated without the City of London.

This Borough also contains a very considerable number of wealthy inhabitants, and a very they are entitled, and to obtain an equal participation in the advantages of a free Constitution. But, whatever may be the feelings and wishes of the people of England generally—at all events, after the statements I have now made to your Lordships, the inhabitants of London must be exempted from this charge. If I considered this great city as the noble Lords opposite do, following the example of their Tory predecessor—who described it to be—

> ——— "The needy villain's home,
> The common sewer of Paris and of Rome;"

If I was of this opinion, undoubtedly I should not support this proposition; but on the contrary, I believe it to be, nay, I am sure it is—the great emporium of this kingdom—replete with the commerce, the trade, and the learning of the world—the mighty heart of the mightiest empire in the world—containing, within its narrow territorial limits, more wealth, patriotism, intelligence, and independence, than many of the greatest kingdoms in the world. Believing these to be the distinguishing characteristics of the inhabitants of this metropolis, shall I ever identify myself with those feelings of distrust and suspicion which would withdraw from them their small pittance of Representation—that limited privilege, for the full exercise of which I, in my conscience, think them peculiarly qualified?—No, my Lords; if there is to be any change in the proposed Representation of the metropolis, my vote shall be given—not for its limitation—but for its extension.

Lord *Wynford* could not agree with the

---

large proportion of moderately rich and highly respectable persons—a large number of tradesmen of the first class, and of persons connected with commerce in all grades, from the wealthy merchant to his warehouseman. It contains also many detached and comfortable houses in the northern parts, inhabited by persons who have retired from business, literary men, persons of small fortunes, and persons having offices and employments in the heart of London. In this respect it is similarly circumstanced with the Mary-le-bone Borough. It contains several large and elegant Squares; the Charter House; the City of London Literary Institution; the grandest Private Literary Establishment in England, the London Institution; and the grandest Public Institution, the British Museum.

3. Lambeth Borough.

This Borough lies Southward of the Thames and of the old Borough of Southwark, and also Westward of the Borough of Southwark, having the Thames as a boundary to a considerable extent on the North and North-west. The population is not so dense as in any of the other Metropolitan Boroughs, and it extends over a larger surface than any of them.

It contains the parish of St. Mary, Newington; the parish of St. Giles, Camberwell, except the Manor and Hamlet of Dulwich; and also such part of the parish of Lambeth as is situate to the North of the line described, from the point at which the road from London to Dulwich, by Red Post Hill, leaves the road from London over Herne Hill, in a straight line to a point in the boundary between the respective Parishes of Lambeth and Clapham, 150 yards South of the middle of the Carriage-way along Acre Lane.

This Borough contains the Palace of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is the most rural of all the Metropolitan Boroughs, and has many first-rate houses delightfully situated, and inhabited by rich and intelligent gentlemen, merchants and bankers. The number of small houses is somewhat larger, proportionally, than either of the Boroughs of Mary-le-bone or Finsbury; but it contains a proportionally larger number of second-rate houses than any other of the New Metropolitan Boroughs. The second-rate houses are occupied with every description of intelligent respectable persons, probably as well informed and as independent as any in Great Britain. Many wealthy persons have Wharfs and Warehouses along the River Thames, and many large manufacturing and trading concerns are established in this Borough. Here are also the most considerable Engineering Factories, especially Messrs. Maudslay and Field's, in the constructing and furnishing of which scarcely less than 200,000*l.* must have been expended. This Borough will bear comparison with any Borough in the kingdom.

4.—Tower Hamlets Borough.

This Borough lies East and North-east of the City of London, East of the Finsbury Borough, and North along the River Thames. It contains the

Tower Division of Ossulston Hundred.

Parish of St. Matthew, Bethnal Green,—St. Botolph, without Aldgate,—St. Leonard, Bromley,—Christ Church, Spitalfields,—St. George in the East,—St. John, Hackney,—St. Anne, Limehouse,—St. Paul, Shadwell,—St. Leonard, Shoreditch,—St. Mary, Stratford-le-Bow,—St. John, Wapping,—St. Mary, Whitechapel.

noble Baron who had just sat down, that the giving Representation to large and populous places was likely to put an end to riot. In disproof of that argument, he would only appeal to the events that had occurred within the last twelve months at Nottingham, Bristol, and in some parts of London. He believed, indeed, that many of those who, in the last election, obtained seats in the other House of Parliament, would never have sat there but for the tumultuous and violent conduct of their partisans, by whom the friends and supporters of other candidates were prevented from going to the hustings. He agreed with the noble Lord, that there was less poverty in London and its suburbs than in the agricultural districts of the country; but he drew from that fact an argument directly the reverse of that advanced by the noble Lord. He (Lord Wynford) maintained, that if in London there was less poverty than in other portions of the country, it was a proof that it was already sufficiently represented in Parliament, and that the want of sufficient Representation was the cause of the agricultural districts being in the distressed condition that they then were. He (Lord Wynford) could not assent to the argument that, because a place was rich and prosperous, it was, therefore, to have a greater share of Representation. On the contrary, he thought that the fact of its prosperity was a decided proof that it stood in need of no greater degree of Representation. He was prepared to admit, that the Tower Hamlets contained more wealth than perhaps any other district in the world; but did the noble Lord mean to represent that that wealth belonged to the inhabitants who lived within those hamlets? Surely

---

Hamlets of Mile End Old Town,—Mile End New Town,—All Saints, Poplar, and Blackwall,—St. George, Ratcliffe.

Precinct of St. Katherine by the Tower,—Liberty of Norton Folgate.

The Tower Liberty.

The Tower within,—The Tower without,—Holy Trinity, Minories,—Old Artillery Ground, Wellclose Square. N.B. Wellclose Square forms part of three of the above-named Parishes of Ossulston Hundred.

The Liberty of the Tower has a Court House and a Court of Requests, and enjoys distinct privileges in other respects, which may almost be considered as the privileges and local jurisdiction of a separate County.

This Borough has within it the Tower of London—the Mint—the St. Katherine's, the London, West India and the East India Docks—the largest private Ship Building Docks on the river—immense Warehouses belonging to the East-India Company, occupying a space as large as many towns—a great number of other Warehouses—many very large Establishments—nearly all the immense Sugar Houses—the largest Cooperages—two great Breweries—many extensive Rope Walks—two large Chain Cable Manufactories—the patent Hemp Cable and Rope Manufactory—several Anchor Smiths, Mast, Block, and Sail Makers—and along the north bank of the river, from the western end of the Tower to Blackwall, nearly every thing which the first port in the world requires for convenience and use.

The Docks and their Warehouses cost upwards of five millions sterling, subscribed by individuals.

The Goods in these Docks are of immense value.

The Goods in Warehouses along shore, and in other parts of this Borough, are also of exceedingly great value. [From returns made to Parliament, Commons' Sessional Paper, No. 152, August 9, 1831, it may be concluded that the Goods deposited in the Docks and Warehouses are worth more than 20,000,000*l.*, duty unpaid.]

The number of Ships of all descriptions and sizes, as well as the Craft, are of very considerable value.

The East-India Warehouses, and the Goods and Merchandize contained in them, are also very valuable.

It is probable that the actual value of the Houses, Docks, Factories, Shipping, Goods, and Merchandize, which this Borough contains, is worth as much as any two of the Metropolitan Boroughs, though the City of London should be one of them.

The proportion of small Houses in this Borough is greater than that of any one of the new Metropolitan Boroughs. In this Borough the system of farming prevails to a very considerable extent, and the actual number of persons renting houses worth 18*l.* a year, who will possess the right of voing, will probably be found as few in proportion to the number of houses under 20*l.* a year rental, as in any of the other Metropolitan Boroughs.

This Borough has every claim to be represented which can be named as a recommendation for any other place, and it has some facilities for public business which no one of the other new Boroughs has.

the noble Lord could not mean to do so. There was scarcely one of their Lordships who was not a contributor and a sharer in the wealth accumulated in that district. There was, perhaps, not an individual among those whom he had then the honour to address, who had not wine in the docks. It was absurd, then, to speak of the wealth of a particular district, or a part of the wealth of the inhabitants who resided in it. The wealth of the Tower Hamlets was the wealth of the merchants of the great city of London, and of the most distant towns in the empire. It was not the wealth of the inhabitants of the Tower Hamlets. But the noble Lord had dwelt at considerable length upon the superior intelligence of London and its suburban districts. London, undoubtedly, contained more intelligence than the small towns of the country; but he (Lord Wynford) conceived that its intelligence was only greater in proportion as its population was greater. So, again, the facilities afforded for the obtaining of information and knowledge, such as the institutions and reading-rooms alluded to by the noble Lord, were only more numerous in London than in other parts of the country in proportion as the population of London was greater than that of any other part of the country. He offered these observations merely to combat the argument advanced by the noble Lord. He now came to a principle. He did not agree that any particular place, either from wealth or from population, had a right to claim a share of Representation in Parliament. He advanced that doctrine as a subject living under a monarchy; but if he lived in a republic he should hold it full as strongly. Representation should only be given as a matter of expediency. It should not be set up as a matter of right. To give any additional Representation to the metropolitan districts was, he must maintain, not only most inexpedient, but most impolitic. He had no objection to give additional Members to the city of London, provided that those additional Members were given to the persons who now exercised the right of voting in the city; but he should object to any addition of Representation to London, if the right of electing the Members were to be given to those who would be admitted to the exercise of the franchise under this Bill. In some instances householders were undoubtedly admitted to the right of voting; but, by the common and general practice under the Constitution of England, the King had never given the franchise to commercial towns or cities, except to the Corporations or Guilds established in those towns or cities, and composed of persons who had real and positive interests to be represented—witness London, Liverpool, Bristol, Hull, and many other places of the same description. Such had invariably been the practice of our ancestors, and in his (Lord Wynford's) opinion, it was, on all occasions, better to adhere to practices so established until it was clearly proved that they were wrong. If Representation were to be given to commercial places because they were commercial places, let the right of electing the Representatives be vested in commercial men—not placed in the hands of individuals who had little interest and no stake in commercial matters. In large towns the 10*l.* qualification was too low: and when he said that, he knew that he spoke the sentiments of an immense majority of Reformers. As applied to the Tower Hamlets, it was a qualification which would admit to the exercise of the elective franchise a mass of paupers—a body of men whom a state of beggary laid open to every species of corruption, and who, with no property of their own, could not be expected to have much respect for the property of others. He complained of it, indeed, as one of the greatest injustices of the Bill, that it gave to poverty and indigence what it denied to wealth and respectability. Besides, the change would be a source of perpetual irritation and bribery, as a similar system was in America. It must be remembered, too, that in many of the districts proposed to be enfranchised, Political Unions had been established, which, if suffered to proceed as they had begun, would lead directly to revolution, and the total subversion of the Constitution. Unless the influence of those Unions were checked by hands more skilful and more determined than those into which the management of public affairs had now fallen, the established institutions of the country must fall before them. Once admit their members to the exercise of the elective franchise, and they would vote their sittings permanent—assemble daily to discuss political matters—and despatch nightly letters or messages of instruction to their Representatives as to the course which they should pursue in Parliament. Thus would the voice and the votes of the House of Commons become subservient to the dictates of the worthy members of these Political Unions. It was for these reasons that he objected to the enfranchisement of the districts named in the schedule then under their consideration; but, standing in the humiliating situation that he then did—no longer speaking or acting as the member of an independent deliberative assembly—he should not call upon their Lordships to express their opinions upon the subject by a division. While the Government of the country rested in the hands of an Administration which suffered itself to become subservient to the dictates of the Press, and of Political Unions, he (Lord Wynford) could never hope to effect anything in that House. However, as long as God was pleased to give him health and strength to do it, he would attend there night after night, to state his objections to those clauses which, in his opinion, would operate prejudicially to the interests of the nation, or endanger the stability of the Constitution; but, until he addressed a House of Lords which had the power of deciding as conscience might dictate, he would not call for divisions.

Lord *Ellenborough* could not entirely assent to the concluding observations of the noble and learned Lord who had just sat down, because he felt that, even if he stood alone, he was still an independent Member of Parliament; and if, upon a division, he knew that he should go below their Lordships' bar alone, he would not hesitate to do so in the discharge of what he conceived to be his duty. He must admit all that the noble Baron (Lord Durham) had said of the superior wealth and intelligence of the metropolitan districts, but he maintained that, if those districts had obtained that wealth and that intelligence without Representation, it was not necessary that they should now be represented. Their interests were, in fact, practically represented by numerous persons sitting in Parliament connected with the trade and commerce which these districts carried on. The circumstance, also, of the Parliament itself being held in the midst of them, must materially operate to their advantage. It was not, therefore, for the sake of their own interests necessary to give them Representatives; and, according to his view, it was not for the interests of the country generally that they should have them. It was quite impossible that the wealth and intelligence of those districts should not possess a material influence over the public opinion, particularly as the owners were in immediate communication with the Government and the Press. That legitimate influence he would wish to continue, but separate Representation he decidedly objected to.

Lord *Wynford* said, that although he, certainly, himself should not divide in Committee, because he considered it useless, still he should be prepared to go below the bar with any noble Lord who thought proper to call for a division.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that all that he had intended to have said upon this clause had been anticipated by the noble Lord (Lord Durham) near him, in the admirable and unanswerable speech which he had that night delivered. His observations, therefore, would be brief in the extreme. A noble Earl opposite had contended, that one of the metropolitan districts was already virtually and practically represented by the number of Members of Parliament who, for the greater portion of the year, were resident in it. That was a proposition to which he could not agree, because he could not conceive how men, by simple residence in any particular place, without any other connection or fellow-feeling with the inhabitants of that place, beyond that which could be derived from mere residence among them, could by any possibility be regarded as Representatives of that place. According to the proposition he was combatting, not only had the people Representatives in the House of Commons, but they had also Representatives in their Lordships' House, because the Members of the House of Lords lived in some of these districts. What signified it to the person who lived in Mary-le-bone, whether a Member of Parliament who also lived in Mary-le-bone, was called a Lord or a Commoner? he was equally a Member of Parliament; and, as he lived in the same place with that individual, he must, according to this argument, be practically the Representative of that place. But the meaning of Representation was, that the person called the Representative should not only have some fellow-feeling for the people — should not only live amongst them—but that he should have communication with them, and be in some degree under their control; that he should be sent to Parliament by them, and that he should not behave exactly as he pleased, without being answerable to those whom he called his constituents. According to the argument which had been advanced, their Lordships represented the whole kingdom, because in the country the Peers lived among one class of persons, and in town they lived among the other class; therefore, all parties had Representatives in their Lordships; but the country had no control over their Lordships. The people did not consider, that the Peers were there for their purpose: they were a useful and necessary branch of the Legislature, but not that branch of the Legislature to which the people looked as belonging peculiarly to themselves, because their Lordships were not answerable to the people—were not elected by them—had not received a trust which, from time to time, their Lordships were required to return into the hands of the people; and for that reason, namely, not being under their control, they did not speak through their Lordships. It was because the people spoke through the Members whom they elected, that those Members were said to be their Representatives. He apologized for detaining their Lordships so long in refuting a proposition which appeared to him manifestly contrary to the true spirit of Representation, both theoretically and practically; and the only answer it required was, to state clearly what that theory and what that practice was; and, having done so, he should dismiss the subject. He must in conclusion say, that he wished this measure to be, as he hoped and trusted it would be, final; but, looking at the question then before them, could any one have the least doubt that, if the measure were carried without the enfranchisement of the metropolitan districts, the question would be revived in the very first Session of a new and Reformed Parliament?

The Earl of *Harrowby* thought, that the speech of the noble Baron opposite, although clear and luminous, and temperate to a degree that must have excited the admiration of all who heard it, was not so perfectly unanswerable as the noble and learned Lord had stated it to be. He thought, indeed, that the noble Baron on his left had given a decided answer to many of the points urged by the noble Baron opposite. But it was not his (the (Earl of Harrowby's) intention to dwell upon those points. He rose for the purpose of adverting to an observation which fell from the noble and learned Lord who had just sat down, and which was so contrary to all that he (the Earl of Harrowby) had ever heard or read upon the subject before, that he could not suffer it, now that it came from so high an authority, to pass by in silence. According to the letter of the Constitution, as he had read and understood it, and according to all the constitutional writers with whose works he was acquainted, a Member once returned to Parliament became the Representative, not of the particular place which elected him, but of the interests of the whole country. The noble and learned Lord, however, seemed to have taken a different view of that point—for he now asserted, that it was necessary for the constituent to have a control over the Representative. If that were so, the independence of Parliament was lost, and, for the future, the Members of the other House would be but the miserable slaves of their constituents. He must, however, assert, that a Member of Parliament did not hold his seat upon the terms and tenure described by the noble Lord. If that had been the case, the country would never have become the greatest, the most prosperous, and freest nation on earth. To know whether Parliament really acted according to its own opinions and judgment, it was necessary to consider the existence or non-existence of that external control of which the noble and learned Lord had spoken in such terms of praise; for the independence of a deliberative representative assembly depended upon the existence or non-existence of such control. It was upon this principle, much more than upon any of those other objections which could be urged with reference to these metropolitan districts, that he opposed this Motion. The influence they would exercise in the House of Commons would be too great in comparison with that exerted by the constituency of the other parts of this country. The Members of all the metropolitan districts would, and ought to be, according to the argument of the noble and learned Lord, to receive their daily and hourly lesson at the hands of their masters; and such instructions would be followed by censure, and threats of dismissal, if not attended to in every particular. Was he stating a supposed, or barely possible case, or an actual fact? What had already happened in Westminster and in London might teach them what would happen elsewhere every week and every day, should this Bill be passed. It had been suggested, however, that the conduct of the people would be peaceable. Recent public meetings were said to be a proof of this assertion; meetings where the people certainly were very peaceably listening to treason, and uttering revolutionary shouts. Such political meetings would be held, day after day, to canvass the motions made by Members, and the votes which they might have given; and if such votes should have been contrary to the opinions of those meetings, votes of censure would be passed on the conduct of the offending Representative, or instructions would be prepared which should dictate to him how to act and what to say; or deputations would call on him to adhere to and obey the mandates of his imperious constituents. The account of a recent meeting at Primrose Hill, and the language held there by the different speakers, might convince their Lordships that he was speaking of no imaginary evil. Under such a position of affairs, it must be matter of calculation, day after day, and hour after hour, how soon the persons who issued these instructions, or fulminated these threats at the heads of the unfortunate Members of the other House were to be the masters also of that House, and whom their Lordships were to serve. If the principle which the noble and learned Lord had asserted, was to be recognized as sound constitutional law, their Lordships would soon live under the worst of Governments, and be the slaves of a vile democracy. He meant to cast no sort of reflection upon that class of persons called by this Bill the "10*l.* voters." Among that class of people there were many—indeed a large proportion of them—who were truly disposed to obey the laws, and exercise the elective franchise in a proper manner; but they were peculiarly liable to be governed by their feelings rather than their good sense, which, in tranquil times, they very generally followed. But it was the duty of Members of Parliament to consult the interest and not represent the momentary feelings and passions of the people; and he believed that a majority of the new constituency would, if left quietly to exercise the franchise, make choice of men who would pursue that course. He dreaded, however, that, under the pretence of Representation, the feelings of these persons might be worked on by those who had improper objects in view, in order that they might act by physical means. Even the late elections afforded many proofs that there were men ready to pursue that course. There were persons on the opposite side of the House who might recollect, when they were candidates for seats in the other House of Parliament, that the contest was conducted, not by means of argument, but by violence and by bludgeons. After having heard such doctrines put forth as he believed were sufficient to shake this empire to its foundation, and destroy every Representative state throughout the world, it was impossible for him to remain silent, and to restrain or conceal the strong feelings which those doctrines excited.

The *Lord Chancellor* was astonished that the calmness and candour which had characterized the observations which had just been addressed to their Lordships by the noble Earl opposite, should not have prevented the noble Earl from making the misrepresentation of which he had been guilty. The noble Earl said, that he (the Lord Chancellor) had promulged an argument, that when once a Member was returned to Parliament, he was solely the Representative of his constituents, and not of the country at large. How the noble Earl could have allowed such an opinion to enter his mind, he was at a loss to conceive, for it was a sentiment, or opinion, which he (the Lord Chancellor) had never expressed, nor thought, nor even dreamt of. What he had urged in the course of the few observations he had addressed to their Lordships was (and he never had heard it doubted), that every Member of Parliament was accountable to his constituents: from those constituents he received a trust, and when into their hands he surrendered it, he was accountable to them for his parliamentary conduct during the time he had held that trust. Did this mean in any sense that such Members were to attend exclusively to the interests of their constituents? The noble Earl had referred to popular feeling, and to the meetings resulting therefrom, as dictating, or tending to dictate, to the Representatives of the persons constituting such meetings. He (the Lord Chancellor) had not said one word with reference to any meetings, but, he begged to ask now, was there to exist no communion of feeling between the Representative and his constituents? He had said before, and, he trusted, it did not admit of misconception, that every Member was accountable to his constituents for his parliamentary conduct, on returning to them the trust confided by them to him; but, at the same time, he begged to be understood as not, for one instant, pretending to dispute, or to deny, the right of the constituency to meet and to discuss in the interim the parliamentary line of conduct pursued by their Representative.

The Earl of *Harrowby* conceived it was not constitutional to call for or to seek from the Representative, a change or deviation from his own general views as to the policy to be observed with reference to important questions to the country; and, he thought, that no body of constituents had the right to call on their Representative to act in opposition to his own views with respect to matters involving the interests of the country.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* deprecated the system of dictation by constituents to their Representatives, and alluded to the case of Sir Robert Wilson, in connexion with the borough of Southwark, who, he contended, had not only been made the subject of control by his constituents, but had actually been obliged to surrender the trust reposed in him by the party who demanded that surrender. The same system would, he anticipated, extend itself to the proposed metropolitan districts. He also contended, that a member for St. Mawes was as clearly a Member for the whole country as a member for Manchester or any other large town.

The *Lord Chancellor* maintained, that a Member of Parliament was under the certain control of his constituents, and that the mode of exercising that control was the only question. The constituent had no power to force the Member to hold his opinions—the only mode of controlling him was, by instructing him during the sitting of Parliament. With respect to the hon. member for Southwark, that gallant General had given a pledge to his constituents that he would act according to their opinion.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, that it could not excite surprise if, after what had fallen from the noble Lord, he wished for a correct explanation of the word control. Were their Lordships under no control? If their Lordships were under no control, what was it prevented them exercising their own judgments, and obliged them to follow the opinions of the Political Unions?

The Marquis of *Salisbury* said, he should not divide the House upon this occasion, because, being in Committee, he could not get his opinion recorded upon the Journals; but he should divide the House upon the bringing up of the report. On the heads of the authors and supporters of the Bill would rest all the evil that would result from it, and he prayed God to grant that that evil might not be so great as he apprehended.

Lord Wharncliffe having expressed his intention of going to a division,

Their Lordships divided on the Motion:—Contents 91; Not-Contents 36;—Majority 55.

The Tower Hamlets were accordingly placed in the schedule.

List of the CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Sussex.

DUKES.

Bedford
Devonshire
Norfolk
Richmond
Somerset
St. Alban's.

MARQUESSES.

Lansdowne
Westminster.

EARLS.

Albemarle
Amherst
Camperdown
Cawdor
Charlemont
Derby
Grey
Hillsborough (Marquis of Downshire)
Huntingdon
Lichfield
Minto
Mulgrave
Munster
Onslow
Oxford
Pomfret
Radnor
Suffolk
Thanet.

VISCOUNTS.

Bolingbroke
Falkland
Goderich
Granville
Hood
Lake.

LORDS.

Amesbury
Auckland
Audley
Boyle (Earl of Cork)
Brougham
Clement (E. of Leitrim)

Clifton (E. of Darnley)
Crewe
Dacre
Dinorben
Dormer
Dover
Dunalley
Dundas
Dunmore (E. of Dunmore)
Durham
Fife (Earl of Fife)
Fingall (Earl of Fingall)
Fisherwick (Marquess of Donegall)
Foley
Godolphin
Gower
Granard (E. of Granard)
Hawke
Holland
Howden
King
Lilford
Melbourne (Viscount Melbourne)
Mendip (Visc. Clifden)
Middleton
Mostyn
Monteagle (Marquess of Sligo)
Panmure
Petre
Poltimore
Ponsonby (Earl of Bessborough)
Ponsonby, of Imokilly
Rosebery
Rossie (Lord Kinnaird)
Saye and Sele
Sefton (Earl of Sefton)
Segrave
Selsey
Sherborne
Somerhill (Marquess of Clanricarde)
Stafford
Suffield
Sundridge (D. of Argyll)
Templemore
Teynham
Vernon
Wellesley (M. Wellesley)
Wenlock
Yarborough.

ARCHBISHOP.

York.

BISHOPS.

Chichester
Hereford
St. David's

List of the NOT-CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Cumberland.
Duke of Newcastle.

EARLS.

Aylesford
Carnarvon
Delawarr
Harrowby
Leven
Malmesbury
Manvers
Orford
Powis
Selkirk
Stamford.

VISCOUNTS.

Arbuthnot
Sidmouth
Sydney.

LORDS.

Bayning
Bexley
Bolton
Boston
De Dunstanville
Douglas
Ellenborough
Gage (Viscount Gage)
Melrose (E. of Haddington)
Ravensworth
Redesdale
Saltoun
Wharncliffe
Willoughby de Broke.
Wynford.

BISHOPS.

Carlisle
Exeter
Gloucester
Salisbury.

The question that Finsbury stand part of schedule C agreed to without opposition.

Upon the question that Mary-le-bone stand part of schedule C,

The Duke of *Newcastle* observed, that there were two plans of Reform before the House—one that of Ministers, and the other that of the noble Baron (Ellenborough), and one was quite as objectionable as the other—one was genuine, and the other was not genuine. He felt himself trampled in the dust by the miserable situation in which the House was placed. He did not quarrel with noble Lords opposite, because they were consistent—though he thought they were taking a part which would most assuredly overturn the country; but he quarrelled with noble Lords on his side of the House, who turned round in harlequin fashion, and expected that he should turn round with them. This measure would render the House ridiculous in the estimation of the world. From this time he should take no further part in the proceedings of the House. To save the character of the House he would move that the Earl of Shaftesbury should read through the clauses of the Bill *pro formâ.* He should give no further countenance, in his own person, to this disgraceful proceeding.

[The noble Duke shortly afterwards left the House.]

Lord *Wharncliffe* could not agree with the noble Duke, but must do his duty in the Committee, and when certain parts of the Bill, of which he disapproved, came under discussion, he should do his duty as an independent Member of that House. From the beginning of the agitation of the question of Reform, he had always been of opinion, that to a considerable measure of Reform they must concede. It was true that he had last year voted against the second reading of the Bill, for the reasons which he had stated on the occasion. But he had voted for it this year, it being, in his opinion, a paramount necessity to read the Bill a second time after it had been twice sent up to them by the House of Commons. He had agreed to the second reading, however, with the view of endeavouring to amend the Bill in the best manner he could in the Committee; and he should fail in his duty if he did not do so. It might be advantageous to express an opinion by a vote in the Committee, and it was for that purpose he had required the recent division. It was his intention to divide the Committee whenever he might consider it beneficial to do so.

Motion agreed to.

Lambeth, Bolton, Bradford, and Blackburn, were then ordered to stand part of the schedule.

Upon the question that Brighton should stand part of schedule C,

The Earl of *Haddington* said, that this was an example of that principle of the Bill to which he had objected. If Brighton was enfranchised, Margate and other places of fashionable resort would have an equal right to Representatives. But the population of a watering place was of a fluctuating character. Brighton was a mere fishing town, without commerce or manufactures, and it influenced the return of one member for Sussex. It was an example of an unmeaning mass of population. He had never heard one argument used in support of the claim of Brighton that did not come within some of the evil consequences which had been alluded to last night; and he, therefore, objected to this town having a Representative.

The Duke of *Richmond* observed, that Brighton was a place of considerable importance. Its population amounted to 40,634 souls, and it paid in assessed taxes the enormous sum of 35,580*l.* They had already given the right of Representation to towns which paid much smaller sums:—to Leeds, which paid only 18,000*l.*; to Bolton, which paid only 4,135*l.*; to Sheffield, which paid only 12,605*l.*; and it was proposed to give it to Dartmouth, which paid only 675*l.* Brighton paid more in assessed taxes than nine large towns which were to be enfranchised. He was quite surprised, therefore, to hear the objections of the noble Earl. Was the noble Earl aware what a constituency the members for Brighton would have? It would be composed principally of persons who, having accumulated fortunes by honest industry had settled there. The members for Brighton would be always found the advocates of peace and good order, and must, therefore, be regarded with favour by those who took what were called conservative views. He had no personal interest in the question, for he had no property there. He only hoped that the House would not, in consequence of its being a watering-place, take an erroneous view of its importance. The noble Duke concluded by observing, that Brighton had a still stronger claim to Representation than any he had yet mentioned. There were more houses in that town rated at 40*l.* a-year than in all the rest of the boroughs contained in the schedule. He confessed, indeed, that he felt much surprise to hear the noble Baron object to enfranchising any place possessed of so much wealth, intelligence, and respectability.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* complained, that no particular interest was to be represented in the town of Brighton, and that the Government were, therefore, inconsistent in proposing to give it Members, purely because there were a number of residents of respectability. Dartmouth, a place of great importance, carrying on an extensive trade, and requiring a Representative for its peculiar interests, was to have one of its Members taken away; while Brighton, a place without any trade, manufacture, or peculiar interests whatever, was, on the contrary, to have two Representatives.

The question that Brighton stand part of the schedule agreed to.

Halifax and Macclesfield were also ordered to stand part of the schedule.

On the question that Oldham stand part of the schedule,

Lord *Ellenborough* took occasion to suggest, that it would be better to adopt the original plan of the original Bill, and that the better arrangement would be, to give two Members to Manchester and Salford, two Members to Bolton, and six Members to the county of Lancaster. That would be a much better arrangement than by dividing, as the Bill at present did, so many as thirteen Representatives amongst several small towns in Lancashire. By the arrangement he proposed, he thought the master manufacturers would be better protected than by the Bill.

Lord *Durham* said, that the alteration from the original Bill had been made at the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet, and the Members of the Opposition in the other House, in whose opinions and feelings the noble Baron was looked upon as concurring. Considering the wealth and respectability of those towns, they were fully entitled to be represented; and it appeared to him, under all the circumstances of the case, better to continue the arrangement as it was, than to adopt the suggestion of the noble Baron, which was diametrically opposed to the plan which had been suggested by his friends in the other House, and which, at their instance, had been acted upon.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that he had acted as his friends had done in the other House. He proposed such amendments as he thought should be made in the Bill, and, if they were not adopted, he reserved to himself the right of voting against the Bill.

Lord *Holland* thought the respectability of Oldham and its population so great, as to entitle it to the vote of the noble Baron upon his own principles of Reform.

Lord *Suffield* knew Oldham, but did not think it so well entitled to two Members as Salford. He, however, would acquiesce in the arrangement, rather than disturb the progress of the Bill. The population of Oldham was only 32,000, and it paid in assessed taxes only 1,900*l.* a-year, while the population of Salford was 50,000, and it paid 9,000*l.* assessed taxes.

The Earl of *Haddington* thought his noble friend had made an excellent case against Oldham, but he begged leave to comment on the low standard attained by this town, in respect of taxation, as compared with other towns inferior in population. The population of Wallingford, a borough in schedule B, was 2,467—of Oldham 32,381: the taxation of Wallingford amounted to 1,073*l.*, that of Oldham to 1,999*l.*—the taxation of the half-disfranchised borough being rather more than half that of Oldham, while its population scarcely exceeded one-fifteenth. St. Alban's contained 4,772 persons, and was not equal to one-sixth of the population of Oldham; but its taxation was nearly equal, amounting to 1,964*l.* Upon the principle, therefore, of population, combined with taxation, the claim of Oldham was very weak. The noble Baron (Lord Holland) seemed to think, that those who voted for the second reading could hardly reject this borough without inconsistency. When it was an object to obtain their Lordships' votes for the second reading, they were told, that every man who was for any Reform whatsoever, ought to vote for the second reading of this Bill. He had voted for the second reading, upon the principles and the reasons which he, at that time, took the liberty of stating. He bound himself to support the principles of enfranchisement, disfranchisement, and an extension of the suffrage; but he did not, by so doing, bind himself to go to the extent, or anything like the extent, which noble Lords had gone. He was willing to give a liberal extension to those principles, but did not feel himself obliged to go the full extent of the plan now proposed for carrying that principle into effect.

The Earl of *Radnor* said, the first question was, whether Oldham had any claim on the ground of population; and the second, whether it had any claim, upon the calculations of Lieutenant Drummond, founded upon the assessed taxes. With respect to the first, Oldham stood higher than fifty-three places, including the boroughs in schedules C and D; and it stood in the list at twenty-two, if taken according to the principle of Lieutenant Drummond, his calculation being founded upon the principle of the assessed taxes, as compared with the population. The assessed taxes of Oldham were not considerable; but, in reference to population, containing upwards of 32,000 persons, it stood upon the list before Macclesfield; and he thought that Oldham was entitled to be put in schedule C. But noble Lords had compared Oldham and Dartmouth, as, on another occasion, Brighton was compared with Dartmouth. With respect to the assessed taxes, the amount paid by Dartmouth was 688*l.*; rather more than one-third of what is paid by Oldham; and with respect to population, that of Dartmouth is 4,662, which is a little short of one-fifth only of the population of Oldham. Looking at Oldham in reference to its population merely, it ought to stand by itself, and so be estimated according to its merits; and when it was remembered that it stood upon the list, according to Lieutenant Drummond's calculation, before twenty-two places, and with regard to population before fifty-three places, it seemed to be fully entitled to be put into schedule C, and to have two Members.

Lord *Ellenborough* begged to remind their Lordships, that they were proceeding in that House on a totally different principle from that which was adopted in the Commons. In the Lower House, they began by disfranchising a large number of boroughs. In that House they were, on the contrary, inquiring as to what number of boroughs and towns they should extend the franchise; and if they could not bear in mind, that in every case they were robbing some place of its right in order to confer it on another, which, perhaps, had very little higher claims on their attention, they would, he was satisfied, involve themselves and the country in endless trouble and contention. This, he repeated, was the question. They were in every case called on to draw a comparison between a place which had possessed the right of returning Members for ages, and some other place, of a perhaps not much greater importance, which it had obtained in the course of later years. This it was necessary they should bear in mind when they proposed to give Representation to Oldham, which had not much greater wealth or importance than some of the places they proposed to disfranchise.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that he understood a division had taken place during his absence from the House. Now he would recommend noble Lords on his side of the House not to divide the Committee any further on this question, as the independence of the House had been sacrificed, and as their following such a course of proceeding could only be pleasing to the noble Earl opposite, who had trampled on the liberties and character of that House. He wished to put a simple question to that noble Earl. He wished to know from him, whether he would consent to the slightest modification in the details of the Bill, without even at all affecting any of its principles. He was desirous to know, for instance, whether, if a judicious alteration should be proposed in that part of the Bill which gave to the voters in towns the right of voting for the counties, he would object to it?

Earl *Grey* said, that it must be plain, that at this stage of the Bill it would be an unnecessary waste of their Lordships' time to discuss the point to which the noble Earl had called his attention. He could have no objection to any appeal which that noble Earl might think fit to make to the House, to any protest which he might enter against its proceedings, and still less would he object to any mode that that noble Earl might employ to place before the public the grounds of his conduct; but when the noble Earl had now, not for the first or second, but for the tenth or twelfth time, repeated in the same phrases, and almost precisely in the same words, the speech which the noble Earl had made on this subject, he (Earl Grey) did think that it would be a trespass on their Lordships' time, and that it would do no good, to answer the remarks of the noble Earl. He regretted the feelings which the noble Earl had expressed as to the character of that House. He could not forget, however, that the noble Earl had, in reference to another question, when it was before them, namely, the Catholic Question, talked in precisely the same language—that he then complained of the majority as being a made majority—that he spoke of the impossibility of at all modifying that Bill—that he described the freedom of debate as then completely destroyed—and that he declared that after the passing of that Bill he should never again enter that House. The noble Earl had, however, he was happy to say, notwithstanding that threat, returned to his labours as a Member of that House, and he did entertain the hope, that hereafter, after the passing of the Reform Bill, there would be still important duties belonging to the Members of that House, and that the noble Earl would return to the performance of them, with credit to himself and with advantage to the country, the interests of which, much as he differed from the noble Earl, he believed the noble Earl was sincerely and honestly desirous to promote. As to the statement of the noble Baron (Ellenborough), that they had commenced with enfranchisement and not with disfranchisement, and that that circumstance materially altered the case; when the noble Baron said that, he (Earl Grey) begged to remind him and the

House, that that very question—namely, the postponement of the disfranchising clause, upon which such important consequences had so lately taken place—was described at the time by the noble Lords opposite as a most trivial one, as one of mere form, and that the greatest surprise was expressed by them that Ministers should divide upon it, and still more that they should, finding the division against them, resign their offices. He had, at the time, and ever since, contended that that question was neither trivial nor unimportant—that it was one which might be fatal to the principle of the Bill, and that it was forcing upon them (the Ministers) the adoption of an entirely different course from that which had been pursued by the House of Commons. The statement now made by the noble Baron fully justified the correctness of that opinion. But he (Earl Grey) was determined to adhere to the principle of the Bill, as passed by the House of Commons; he thought that the number of places which that Bill declared to be disfranchised should be disfranchised, and Oldham was, in his opinion, one of those places which was entitled to possess the franchise in their stead, He should adhere to the Bill as it was, and he thought that Oldham was one of those towns which were entitled to return two Members. He should now answer the question of the noble Earl (Winchilsea), who had asked whether he would consent to the slightest modification of the Bill.

The Earl of *Winchilsea:* No; the point to which he had directed the noble Earl's attention was, whether he was prepared to admit any alteration in respect to voters for towns voting also for counties, which he considered was of vast importance to the measure.

Earl *Grey:* On that particular question, all he could state was, that this was not the time for debating it. When that part of the Bill came before their Lordships, he should be extremely happy to hear any statement of the noble Earl; and if the noble Earl's statement should be successful in convincing him (Earl Grey), he trusted he should not be so perverse as to refuse his consent. At the same time, as at present advised, he saw no reason for the alteration. Whatever modification or alterations, however, were proposed, he should be ready to hear them, to discuss them, and decide.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that the noble Earl, from the first introduction of the Bill, had induced him to believe that he was prepared to agree to modifications and alterations; but he was now convinced, that not one tittle of the alterations proposed by that (the Opposition) side of the House would be assented to. The course pursued by the noble Earl had been so dictatorial, that he could not but wonder at the callousness of the House. The noble Earl had alluded to his (the Earl of Winchilsea's) conduct on that fatal measure, the Catholic Bill; but that measure had not been carried in the same dictatorial manner as this. He would assert, in the face of the country, that there was an end to the independence of that House; and it was under that impression that individual Members had left the House. It was useless to tell him that it made any difference whether, 100 more Members walked into that House, or that 100 Members walked out of it. The independence of the House was equally and completely destroyed. [The noble Earl was proceeding to vindicate the vote he gave on the Catholic Relief Bill, when a Peer cried "Question".] Question (exclaimed the noble Earl)! Let the individual come forth and show himself who calls question.

Lord *Lyttelton* rose to order. The cry of "Question" came from his lips; for when he heard the noble Earl proceeding to discuss, in terms sufficiently strong, a question not before the House, sitting, as he (Lord Lyttelton) did, next to the Earl Marshal, and first Peer of the realm, and finding this most offensive subject introduced in so disorderly a manner—— [Here the noble Lord was interrupted by cries of "Order."]

Lord *Kenyon* rose to call the noble Baron to order. The noble Earl (Grey) had reflected on the noble Earl near him (the Earl of Winchilsea), who was perfectly justified in vindicating his conduct.

Earl *Grey* observed, that he had merely referred to a former declaration of the noble Earl from which he had receded, and had remarked, that the same change of opinion might happen again.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that the declaration he had made, on the occasion to which the noble Earl referred, he had honestly intended to act upon; but although his opinions with regard to the measure had not in the slightest degree changed, he had been induced by the persuasions of friends, upon whose judgment he relied, to recede from his resolution to withdraw from the House. There was, however, no analogy between that measure and the present. He would show to the House and to the country, the unconstitutional exercise of authority by which this Bill would be carried, in order that after-times might know the blow which was struck at the independence of Parliament and the Crown at the suggestions of sedition.

Lord *Lyttelton* said, that after the House had permitted the noble Earl to continue his course of argument so irrelevant to the question, he had only to apologize for the interruption he had offered.

Lord *Suffield* said, that the only question before the House was, whether Oldham should be enfranchised. He should speak to that question, and say, that in his opinion Oldham was entitled to have two Members.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, that in putting disfranchisement before enfranchisement, it had never been intended to meddle with the disfranchising part of the Bill—with schedule A—which, after all, was the ground upon which the decision of the House, on the first night of the Committee, was blamed: and, therefore, the noble Earl (Grey) had obtained no triumph by the debate, as the noble Earl seemed to suppose. It had been said, that the object of the majority on that occasion was, to curtail schedule A; and a noble friend of his had stated to him (Lord Wharncliffe), that the reason of his voting in the minority was, because he thought it was an attack upon schedule A. That was, however not the fact.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that if he did not hope that the noble Earl would not wholly abandon his order, he should not keep up his opposition to the Bill. But he thought it not impossible that they might extort some alterations from the noble Earl, though they must give up all hope of any modification. Noble Lords on that (the Opposition) side of the House did not wish to put the noble Earl to the uncomfortable necessity of another journey to Windsor. They wished the Bill to be fairly and temperately considered. He did not envy the noble Earl his position; he would rather have the little honesty he (Lord Londonderry) possessed than the noble Earl's power, coupled with the reproach of being the first individual to bring forward a measure to annihilate the glorious Constitution of the country.

The *Lord Chancellor* wished to call the attention of their Lordships to the question before them, which was merely whether the town of Oldham should be inserted in schedule C, and from that place they had been wandering for the last hour and a half. There were two things to be observed with regard to this town; the first was, that the town itself was a very large and populous manufacturing town, independent of that part of the district which formed the township. The population of the town amounted to 20,000 persons, and that of the township to 12,000, making in all a population of 32,000, and, therefore, a place of considerable importance. The second point to be considered was, that, with some trifling exceptions, the whole of the inhabitants were engaged in the same, and a peculiar branch of business; and he, therefore, was of opinion, that Oldham was justly entitled to a share in the Representation. The objection made to the Motion had been so sufficiently answered, that he would not enter further into the discussion.

Lord *Kenyon* said, that if their Lordships would examine schedule C, they would find that the cotton trade, which was the trade of Oldham, would be sufficiently represented without giving Members to that place. The schedule already contained Manchester, Bolton, Bradford, and Blackburn, of all which the staple trade was the cotton manufacture.

Earl *Grey* stated, that the principal trade of Bradford was not the cotton trade.

Lord *Kenyon* begged that the noble Earl would not interrupt him. He would not permit the noble Earl to interrupt him. He was an independent Member of that House, and he would not allow himself to be interrupted. If he could allow any noble Lord to interrupt him, it certainly should not be the noble Lord who had endeavoured to subvert and destroy the privileges of that House.

Earl *Grey* rose merely to say, that he had not intended to interrupt the noble Lord, but only to set him right, by stating that the trade of Bradford was not, as the noble Baron supposed, the cotton trade.

Lord *Kenyon* was satisfied with the explanation of the noble Earl, and he was sorry that he had mistaken the noble Earl's intention. When he saw that by the enfranchisement of Manchester and the other places which he had mentioned, sufficient Representation was given to the particular interests with which those places were connected, he could not admit, that there was any reason for giving Members to Oldham, which, compared to the other towns, was an insignificant place. That was, however, a matter of minor importance, because the general tendency of the Bill, and, indeed, its inevitable consequence would be, the destruction of the monarchy. By forcing that measure upon their reluctant Sovereign, the noble Earl opposite had placed the King, his kind master, in a situation in which he could make no choice of another Minister. The noble Earl had involved his royal master in a predicament, and he could not but think, that the noble Earl would yet look back with remorse at the part he had taken, and at the course he was now pursuing [" *oh, oh!*"]. If noble Lords interrupted him he should insist on his privilege, and would move an adjournment. The advice which the noble Earl had given his Sovereign, to exercise his prerogative in so unconstitutional a manner as to destroy the independence of that House, was most improper, and he called upon the noble Earl to reconsider the course he had so rashly and so wildly entered into—a course so atrocious—

Earl *Grey*. Atrocious! my Lords. I put it to your Lordships, is it consistent with the usages of this House, or with ordinary propriety, that the noble Lord should apply such language to me? For my part, I can only reject the words with contempt and scorn.

Lord *Kenyon*: In the words of the noble Earl, I say, that I repel his attack upon me with contempt and scorn. I repeat, that I think the conduct of a Minister of the Crown, in advising the most unconstitutional exercise of the King's highest privilege, for the purpose of destroying the independence of this House, was rash, wild and atrocious. Whether the noble Earl be pleased or not with my using the word atrocious, the privileges of this House have not yet been abrogated to such an extent that the noble Earl can prevent me from saying, what I shall always feel, that it was a most atrocious act of the Minister to give such advice to the King [" *order*."] Whatever noble Lords might think—

Earl *Grey*: My Lords I again rise to order; and I must again say, that anything more unparliamentary—more unwarrantable, and more disorderly—than the applying of such words to me, I never heard in this House. It is for the House to act as may seem befitting its own dignity; but for me, all that remains to me is, to throw back those words with the utmost scorn, contempt, and indignation —indignation and contempt that I cannot find words properly to express. When, on a question having no relation to such a topic, the noble Baron thinks proper to arraign my conduct, I can only say, let the noble Earl bring his charges in a regular manner, and I shall be ready to vindicate my conduct. On this occasion I shall say no more than that I have never done anything inconsistent with my duty to my Sovereign or to my country, or with that debt of gratitude which I owe his Majesty, from whom I have on all occasions received as great kindness as any Minister of the Crown ever received at the hands of his Sovereign. I repeat, then, that I throw back with scorn and contempt the charge that my conduct has been wild and atrocious. But, my Lords, this is not the time to argue these topics; and I shall, therefore, say no more than this, that if his Majesty was left alone, that was not done by my fault. I resigned my situation when I found that I could not fill it with honour to myself, nor with advantage to the country, and I returned to office when I found that my services could be useful to the King and to the country, and not derogatory to my own honour. The noble Lord has thought proper to make upon me an attack which was improper and indecent. My Lords, as the noble Baron has made this attack upon me at a time when the question before the House is whether the word Oldham shall be inserted in the clause—if the noble Lord does not think proper to retract the expressions which he has used, my only answer to the attack made upon me is, that I repel it with scorn and contempt.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* thought, that the noble Earl was exceedingly sensitive to-night. On a former occasion the same words had been used by a noble Earl on that side of the House—not once, but twice. Addresses to the Crown had been he might say, in a degree sanctioned by the noble Earl, which were seditious, and treasonable.

Earl *Grey* asked, did the noble Earl charge him with bringing forward or encouraging treasonable Addresses to his Majesty?

The Earl of *Winchilsea* did not accuse the noble Earl of directly sanctioning and encouraging those attacks upon the Sovereign; but he said, that the most seditious calumnies and treasonable publications had been put forth in every part of the country under the name of Addresses to the Crown, and the Government of the noble Earl had done nothing to check them. It was the noble Earl's duty to maintain the honour of the Crown, and that he had not done. He had placed the King in such a situation that no Ministry could be formed but that of the noble Earl.

The Duke of *Cumberland* assured the House that it was not his intention to take up much of their time, and he hoped no Peer would suppose that there was any intention, in anything he might say, to add to the irritation which had appeared in the House. His sole object in rising was, to implore noble Lords to tranquillize themselves, and to consider the situation of the country. This was not the way to carry the Bill, or to oppose it. He took the liberty of stating to their Lordships, that he should have nothing to do with the discussion if this proceeding in the House were continued. He certainly did not approve of the Bill; but God forbid that he should oppose it in such a manner as would be productive of more harm than good. He, therefore, implored the House not to be irritated, but to consider calmly what they were doing. He trusted their Lordships would excuse him for making these observations. He could assure them that he had no other object at heart but the salvation of his country; and, he believed, that the only way in which that object could be effected, was by dispassionately considering the question before them. He believed that none of their Lordships would express sentiments which they did not conscientiously entertain; but he entreated them not to let their passions get the better of their judgment.

Question agreed to, and Oldham placed in the schedule.

Stockton, Stoke-upon-Trent, and Stroud, were then severally placed in the schedule.

On the question that the clause, with the schedule, stand part of the Bill,

Lord *Wynford* said, that the clause differed from the corresponding one in the two former Reform Bills, and wished an amendment to be made which should restore it to the same form. His objection was, that the clause, as it now stood, rendered the operation of the Reform Bill dependent upon the passing of another, the Boundaries' Bill, which might not pass that Session or the next, so that, if a dissolution should take place in the mean time, the Bill would be inoperative as respected the places in that clause. If the returns were perfect, the House could settle the boundaries, and send back the Bill perfect to the other House. There was no precedent for making the operation of one bill dependent upon another to be passed at a future time. Such a proceeding was contrary to every principle of legislation.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that the Act of Union between Scotland and England furnished a precedent for the clause to which the noble and learned Lord objected. In the Act of Union, a reference was made to an Act to be afterwards passed. But, suppose the Boundaries Bill should not pass, if their Lordships turned to the 79th and 80th sections of the Bill then before them, they would find that case provided for.

The Earl of *Radnor* could not concur in the apprehension of the noble and learned Lord that there was any danger that Parliament would stultify itself so far as not to pass the Boundaries' Bill. The noble and learned Lord said, that in case of a dissolution taking place before the Boundaries' Bill should have been passed, then the places contained in the schedule would not be able to send Members to Parliament. But the fact was, that, even supposing that the Boundaries' Bill should never pass, there was in the Reform Bill itself a schedule L, which provided for the boundaries of those towns. The noble and learned Lord, therefore, had found a mare's nest.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that the clause to which his noble friend (the Earl of Radnor) alluded, certainly provided against the inconvenience which might arise if a dissolution should take place after the passing of the Reform Bill, and before the passing of the Boundaries' Bill.

Lord *Howard of Effingham* thought, that too much stress was laid upon the importance of precedent. He would ask them to look to the state of the country, and to say whether they were not bound to do the best they could for their country, whether they could find precedents for their measures or not.

Lord *Ellenborough* asked, did not the noble Lord know, that, until after the passing of the Boundaries' Bill, all the boroughs in schedule B would remain untouched? He thought that the most convenient course would be, to carry the Boundaries' Bill and the Reform Bill through Parliament *pari passu.*

Clause agreed to.

On the fourth clause being put,

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that nothing he had heard tended to diminish his objections to the schedule (D). He should not then detain the House by stating his objections. He would only ask, was it the intention of the noble Earl to go on further to-night?

Earl *Grey* replied, that he thought the Committee might go on until twelve.

On the question that Ashton-under-Lyne stand part of schedule D,

Lord *Ellenborough* objected to the enfranchisement of that place—it had not appeared in the first or second Bill, and he had heard no reason wherefore it appeared now in that schedule. He knew that the people of Staley-bridge did not wish to be enfranchised as a part of the constituency of Ashton; but there was no reason why Ashton should not be united to Oldham, with which it was connected. The union of the two places might give a respectable constituency. But now, in order to eke out a constituency, it had been found necessary to take in a country district for ten miles round.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that Ashton-under-Lyne was a place of considerable importance, containing 14,000 inhabitants. Its interests were quite distinct from those of Oldham, and he saw no reason why the latter place should be swamped. The objection on the part of the people of Staley-bridge to be enfranchised was not so much that they did not wish to be represented, but that they did not wish to be united with Ashton. The affections of the two places were not in direct proportion with their proximity. The objection of the parties themselves to the union was a sufficient reason why they should not be united. As to the difference between this clause and the former Bill, he (the Lord Chancellor) considered it an improvement.

Question agreed to.

The question that Bury stand part of the schedule agreed to.

On the question that Chatham stand part of the schedule,

Lord *Ellenborough* could see no reason why this place should not be united to Rochester, on the principle on which such large additions had been made to the constituency of Bristol, Liverpool, and other places. By this Bill Chatham would become like Greenwich, a Government nomination borough.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that it had been found that Rochester itself could furnish an adequate constituency, and Chatham was of sufficient importance to entitle it to be represented.

Question agreed to.

On the question that Cheltenham be included in the schedule,

Lord *Ellenborough* intimated that he would not oppose the enfranchisement of that place, as it would furnish a most respectable constituency.

Question agreed to.

House resumed — Committee to sit again.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Tuesday, May 22, 1832.

MINUTES.] Papers ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WOOD, Accounts of the Manufacture and Exportation of Soap.—On the Motion of Sir FRANCIS VINCENT, the Expense and Services of the New South Wales Veteran Companies, from 1825 to the present period.

Petitions presented. By Mr. E. L. BULWER, from Walter Honeywood Yate, for the Amendment of the Laws relative to Debtors;—from the City of London, for a Repeal of the Laws relative to Dramatic Entertainments;—and from Perth, for the Abolition of the Stamp and Paper Duties.—By Mr. GEORGE VERNON, from Ilkeston;—by Mr. ATHERLEY, from Cheltenham;—by Lord WILLIAM LENNOX, from King's Lynn;—and by Mr. HUNT, from Preston,—for Stopping the Supplies.—By Mr. STRUTT, from Derby, in favour of the Birth Registration Bill.—By Mr. MACKINNON, from Rosshire, for Relief to the West-India Interest;—and from Haddington aud Burntisland, to substitute the Chief Magistrates for the Sheriffs, as Returning Officers, and the Burgh Clerks for the Sheriffs Clerks to receive the Claims of Voters under the Reform of Parliament (Scotland) Bill.

CREATION OF PEERS—WITHHOLDING SUPPLIES.] Mr. Edmund Peel presented a Petition from Newcastle-under-Lyne, in favour of the Reform Bill, praying that it might be passed by Earl Grey and his colleagues, and praying the House to withhold the supplies till it had become the law of the land.

Mr. *Hume* wished to take that opportunity of adverting to some misapprehension that had gone abroad as to what fell from the right hon. member for Stamford (Mr. Tennyson) on a former day. It had been produced by a remark from him (Mr. Hume), that he hoped the passing of the Reform Bill would be secured, and that certain individuals in public offices, hostile to it, would be removed as soon as possible. The hon. member for Stamford had mistakenly supposed that by this observation he (Mr. Hume) meant to recommend a creation of Peers at all events; upon that assumption the right hon. Gentleman made some observations which had been misunderstood, and which he should be happy to hear explained.

Mr. *Tennyson* was happy also to avail himself of this opportunity of setting himself right on a point which had been extraordinarily misunderstood. What he had said had been made matter of calumny against him, both through the public Press and in private society; and it had been charged against him, that having on that day had an audience of his Majesty, he had made use of it for the purpose of counselling the King to take a course directly repugnant to that which he had throughout advocated. On the former day he had risen upon the impulse of the moment, and without premeditation, with the truest and most loyal feelings, having just quitted the presence of a Sovereign, from whom he had heard the most firm, patriotic, and dignified sentiments on the question of Reform, the importof which was, that his people should obtain a measure of Reform quite as beneficial and extensive as that before Parliament. He (Mr. Tennyson) had nothing to retract in what he had then uttered, nor did it require any excuse. What he then said, he now repeated—that if the Reform Bill could be passed without doing that which would be a shock to the Constitution, he should be the more rejoiced at it. Had he been a Minister of the Crown, he would have recommended what Earl Grey and his colleagues had advised, and if that advice were not taken —like Earl Grey and his colleagues, he would have tendered his resignation. It did not follow, however, that the Crown was to be blamed and calumniated for pausing before it took such a course. He hoped that the means had now been found of avoiding it, and he thought that all the friends of the Constitution ought to be grateful to his Majesty for having found them. He (Mr. Tennyson) had been one of those who had blamed the Government for not making Peers long ago, for general purposes and objects, without waiting until the necessity was apparent upon the particular measure. As to other calumnies directed against himself, he could only say, that in public or private he had never expressed any other opinion than that he had now offered. A plenary Reform was absolutely necessary at all events, and, in his judgment, it could not have been carried by the Duke of Wellington, or by any other man at the head of affairs, who had pledged himself to a contrary system. It was not necessary for him to say, that he could not offer to the King any suggestion opposed to the principles he had repeatedly avowed. There was only one other point on which he should touch, and which was, that he was said to be in treaty with the Duke of Wellington—that had been stated in the *Morning Chronicle*—and that there were some boroughs with which he was connected which had an interest adverse to Reform. Now was it possible, after a long life passed, and no inconsiderable sacrifices made, in favour of Reform, that he could do this? It was not worth his while to descend so far as to give this an answer, further than to say, that he had never been engaged with the Duke of Wellington, for himself or any one else, as to any Administration, or in any other negotiation, except with regard to some seats held by hon. friends of his.

Mr. *Beaumont* said, that the final defeat of Reform, owing to the non-creation of Peers by Earl Grey in the present stage of the measure, would occasion a much more violent shock to the Constitution than could be produced by any addition to the House of Lords.

Petition to be printed.

Mr. *Sanford* presented similar petitions from Frome, Selwood, and Chard, and said, that had not the Government retained office, he was ready to exercise the privilege of the House with respect to stopping the Supplies.

Mr. *Briscoe* expressed his entire concurrence in the prayer of the petition, and said, that he had received instructions from his constituents to support their petitions to the same effect which had been intrusted to his hon. colleague, who had not as yet had an opportunity of presenting them.

Mr. *Tennyson* wished to say another, word. He agreed with the petitioners and if he could now contemplate the rejection of that great measure, would certainly join in exercising the constitutional power vested in that House of refusing the Supplies. But he believed the Government now had the means of carrying the measure, and there was, therefore, no necessity for having recourse to that privilege.

Mr. *Hume* had received instructions from his constituents, which were, that he should refuse any Supplies until the Reform Bill was passed. This was the best security they could have for its passing. The petitions did not say, " Do not give Supplies to the Duke of Wellington, or do not give Supplies to Earl Grey, but give no Supplies until the Bill is passed." A few days would suffice to show what would be its fate in the Lords, and he would wait to see that before he consented to grant Supplies.

Petitions to be printed.

Lord *Morpeth* said, that he had a great number of petitions from the county of York, and two from other places, all of which had originated from the circumstances in which the country had recently been placed, and from which he hoped it had now happily emerged. The petitioners all concurred in the hope that the House would take means for the speedy passing of the Reform Bill in full efficiency, and that it should not be taken out of the hands of the friends who had originated it. He was happy in the hope that these petitioners would have leave again to unite the ideas of a parental King, a trustworthy Government, and the Reform Bill. The noble Lord concluded by presenting petitions from Halifax, and fourteen other places in Yorkshire, all praying the House to stop the Supplies until the Reform Bills were passed.

Petitions to be printed.

NAVIGATION LAWS AND COMMERCIAL POLICY.] Mr. *Robinson* spoke to the following effect: Mr. Speaker*; Before I proceed with the Motion of which I have given notice, I beg leave to present a Petition from between 800 and 900 Inhabitants of Worcester, including the Mayor, Magistrates, Bankers, Traders, and others, relative to the Trade and Commerce of the Country.

It is most satisfactory to me that, representing a large and populous city, so great a portion of the most respectable and intelligent of my constituents concur generally with my views on this subject. As, however, it will be necessary for me to discuss the several points adverted to in this petition at considerable length, I shall merely move, that it be brought up and read.

Petition read as follows.

"To the honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled :

"The Petition of the Undersigned the Mayor and Magistrates, Bankers, Traders, and Inhabitants of the City of Worcester, and of Persons residing in its Vicinity showeth ;—

"That divers Statutes, passed in former periods by the Legislature of these kingdoms, which provided for the especial protection and support of the trade and manufactures of the country, have been repealed, or rendered null and useless by other Statutes of later years, enacted more especially (as is therein recited) for the extension and freedom of trade :

"And whereas, in the operation of these later Statutes, divers traders and manufacturers of Great Britain, who are unable, from various causes, to produce their commodities as cheap as foreigners, are deprived of much of their trade, and of the home market for their productions :

"And whereas, in consequence of this privation, large numbers of those labourers, whom these traders and manufacturers could constantly have employed, have now only partial employment, to the great distress of the trading and labouring classes—both masters and servants ; to the unprecedented increase of pauperism and poor-rates; and to the alarming defalcation of the public revenue of the State :

> "Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honourable House will be pleased to re-examine the principles on which these later Statutes were founded.

"Your petitioners approach your honourable House with this, their earnest prayer, because they believe, that this change in the ancient policy of the laws, and the evil consequences which have resulted therefrom, arise from two causes.

"*First.*—A reliance on the doctrine of certain speculative persons called political economists, who hold that if any nation, by freedom of trade, loses a market for some portion of its manufactures, such nation will, by freedom of trade, acquire an adequate increase or remuneration in the sale of its remaining manufactures.

---

* Reprinted from the edition published by Ridgeway, to which the hon. Member prefixed the following motto: "The liberal reward of labour, as it is the necessary effect, so it is the natural symptom of increasing national wealth. The scanty maintenance of the labouring poor, on the other hand, is the natural symptom that things are at a stand ; and their starving condition, that they are going fast backwards."—*Adam Smith.*

"*Secondly.*—An expectation that the liberal example of Great Britain, in this instance, will be followed by a reciprocal liberality on the part of other nations, and that thus the sale of British manufactures will, on the whole, be augmented.

"With respect to the first of these causes, your petitioners beg leave, with unfeigned respect to your honourable House, to adduce arguments to show that the doctrines of the political economists are grounded on erroneous principles.

"1. The argument of the economists is, that as all money, with which any foreign manufacture may be purchased, must have been acquired by the sale of British manufactures to some foreign States, we, in purchasing the manufactures of other countries, occasion the sale of an equal amount of our own. This is fallacious reasoning, and the real operation of the system is this: Those nations in which British manufactures are consumed, are generally nations of small population, and which, for that reason, have no manufactures. Those who sell their manufactures to us, France, for instance, are populous nations; and these do not consume our manufactures, or will not allow the importation of them, because they have their own population to employ and maintain. Nations of the former description must, from their necessity, purchase the manufactures of other States, and experience no loss thereby; whilst we, in purchasing foreign manufactures, abstract so much profit or money from the wages of British labourers. We save, as consumers, some trifling part of the price; but we deprive our own trade and industry of the whole of the price; and this whole of the price is finally wrung from us again, in the form of increasing poor rates, or national taxation.

"2. It is incontrovertible that when we purchase any article of foreign manufacture, the bulk of the price of that article goes to pay the wages of foreign labourers. It is no less clear, that as these labourers, of necessity, expend their wages in their immediate subsistence, they cannot be the customers to that amount in the purchase of our manufactures. If it be contended, that this money passes from their hands to other persons, who spend it in our manufactures, it should be remembered that there would, at least, have been as much so spent by the persons into whose hands this money or wages must have come after forming the wages of British labourers. Thus the free-trade system, according to the doctrine of the economists, is a simple transfer of so much money from British to foreign labourers.

"Your petitioners are aware that many supposititious cases may be propounded, in which, upon this new and theoretic principle of trade, sophism may pass for truth. They, therefore, humbly pray that they may be permitted, in support of their present petition, either by written answers to written interrogatories, or by examination at the Bar of your honourable House, the opportunity of proving that, in any conceivable case, truth is in their favour.

"Your petitioners beg in this place, also, to be permitted respectfully to observe, that the truth of their averment is supported by past experience, and by the evidence of by-gone facts. During the whole continuance of those laws, which had for their object the especial protection and support of the trade and manufactures of their own country, the British nation enjoyed a degree of prosperity to which we now look back with envy and with wonder. From the day that the dogmas of the economists, or what is now erroneously called the free-trade system, was adopted, notwithstanding a great and praiseworthy diminution of taxation has taken place, yet bankruptcy, distress, and pauperism, have been incessantly increasing. And your petitioners are prepared to show, that these appalling evils must increase so long as this pernicious system continues to be adopted.

"As to the second cause of the distress alluded to by your petitioners, viz., the expectation that the liberal example of Great Britain would be followed by other nations, your petitioners beg leave, with great respect to your honourable House, to observe, that this expectation has in no instance yet been realized, and that there are cogent reasons to believe that it never will be. In every country which produces manufactures, the most anxious care and the greatest difficulty of that Government are, to provide that there be abundance of regular and productive employment for the people. As, however, Great Britain excels all other nations in the number of its manufactures, a free trade with Great Britain by these nations, would be, in effect, a transfer of a certain quantity of manufacturing employment, from the subjects of those States to the subjects of Great Britain. And as it is a matter of necessity to provide employment and maintenance for the people, and matter of superfluity to obtain the luxurious productions of industry at the lowest prices, it appears to your petitioners that the admission by foreign nations of a free trade with Great Britain, would be, on their part, a sacrifice of that which is necessary, to that which is superfluous.

"The capital and the trade of your petitioners, and the industry by which they live, are, therefore, exposed to the competition of foreign rivals, who do not, and in fact cannot, with benefit to themselves, reciprocally throw open their markets to British productions; notwithstanding which, by the modern Statutes to which we have before alluded, this country allows an almost unrestricted importation of articles from these nations, to come in competition with our own. There is thus created in this country a permanent excess of the competition of those who supply the productions of industry, above the competition of those who consume such productions. For this cause there must naturally be a depreciation incessantly increasing of every production in which British capital is invested, or in which British industry finds employment. In this depreciation we witness already the insolvency or the bankruptcy of a vast proportion of British traders, the pauperism of a vast proportion of the British people And as these evils are now indisputably found to flow, not from fortuitous or transient causes, but from system, from a philosophy, an experiment, false in its very foundation, your petitioners see no prospect before them, but that, as long as this system continues, a declining commerce, and a declining revenue—increasing pauperism and increasing discontents, must be the portion of this once prosperous and happy country.

"Your petitioners, therefore, in conclusion, humbly pray, that your honourable House will be pleased to institute an immediate inquiry into the questions—whether the commerce and navigation of the country have not gradually been declining since the introduction of the principles of the free-trade system; and whether the re-enactment of the whole, or some part of those wholesome and patriotic Statutes, under which the British people enjoyed unrivalled prosperity, is not necessary for the revival of trade.

"And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c."

Petition to be printed.

The hon. Member then continued. Sir; In rising to submit a Motion of great importance, of which I have long since given notice, I am aware how greatly I need the kind indulgence of the House; for, on a subject embracing the vast and complicated interests of commerce and navigation, it will be necessary for me to trespass on its patience at considerable length. I hope, however, that whatever hon. Gentlemen may think of the humble individual who ventures on so arduous a task, they will favour him with their indulgence, and will give that attention which the nature and importance of the subject requires.

I am conscious of my own incompetency to do justice to such a Motion, and the only apology I can offer to the House for having brought it forward is, that other Members, more competent, and of greater experience than myself, have not undertaken it. I think, also, that the time has arrived when, instead of continuing to indulge in vague and doubtful speculation, the Legislature is bound to review the commercial policy pursued by this country during the last twelve years, in order to discover, by the infallible test of past experience, whether the course into which we have recently deviated can be safely continued, or, after careful examination and diligent inquiry, it should be revised and amended.

In the year 1819, this country experienced the increasing pressure of commercial competition, both at home and abroad. Aggravated symptoms of that distress, which has since become so general and severe, were evident amongst the whole of the trading community, and of the various interests connected with commerce and manufactures; and when the Act of that year, for a return to cash payments, by the establishment of an exclusively gold standard, was passed, which has been described (perhaps with some exaggeration) as lowering the value of all fixed property one-third—when apprehensions were naturally entertained of a diminution of our trade with foreign nations, it was thought expedient, by many mercantile men, that the commerce and navigation of the country might be placed on a more secure basis, and be materially extended, by a careful revision of the accumulated Statutes, amounting nearly to 2,000, which were then in force for the protection and regulation of trade; and that, so far from their continuance being required in the then altered state of the commercial world, many of these laws were useless, and others positively detrimental.

In 1820, the celebrated petition of the merchants of London on this subject was presented to this House by the hon. member for Thetford. This petition has been considered to contain the foundation of those principles of free trade which have since been partially adopted and acted upon in this country, and which certain theorists in political economy are disposed to push to an infinitely greater extent than was contemplated, either by the petitioners, or by those Statesmen in Parliament who acted upon their views.

Similar petitions followed from the principal trading and manufacturing towns, and the result was, the appointment of Committees of both Houses of Parliament to inquire into the subject.

I have lately referred to the London petition, and am bound to say, that amongst the names affixed to it, are to be found merchants of the greatest intelligence and experience in the commercial affairs of the country at that period. It was not, however, very numerously signed, having less, I believe, than 200 names. The hon. Member who presented it, supported the prayer of this petition in a speech of great ability, which deservedly commanded much attention, and made a considerable impression on the House of Commons and the country; but Parliament was then fully aware of the risks to which the commerce and trade of Great Britain might be exposed by sudden changes and alterations in our commercial policy, and great caution and circumspection were, therefore, recommended. It was admitted, however, that some relaxation of the laws then in force for the protection of trade and navigation, might give a new impulse to our foreign commerce, and possibly lead to a more extended introduction of British manufactures into those countries from which they were wholly or partially excluded. I am not disposed to deny that such consequences might fairly have been contemplated, but it is my purpose to show that the experiment has altogether failed.

In order that the House may clearly see what were the views and objects of the promoters of a change in our commercial policy, then recommended, and which the present Government pretend they are only endeavouring to carry into full effect, I will proceed to read some extracts from the Report of the Committee of the Houses of Lords and Commons, and then leave hon. Members to judge how far the principles therein recommended are in accordance with the declared opinions which have been promulgated by some of our modern statesmen.

The Commons' Report states:—

'They are conscious that the commercial results they sanguinely anticipate, 'from the establishment of a system more 'enlarged and liberal than that under 'which the British trade has hitherto been 'conducted (of which the relaxation of 'the Navigation Laws forms a part), could 'not be deemed a satisfactory compensation 'for any serious hazard to which the interests of our shipping might be exposed.

'Flowing as this concession will do, 'from the spontaneous and liberal feelings 'of the British Legislature, neither granted 'as the condition of advantages obtained 'from other states, nor guarded by any 'pledge of the public faith, should it be 'attended by consequences inconsistent 'with the regard due to these objects, it 'may, without affording the slightest 'ground for reasonable complaint, or the 'impeachment of our justice or liberality, 'be subject at any time to such modifications as may be required, or even, if 'necessary, be absolutely revoked.

'While we preserve to our manufactures 'a preference in the home market, and the 'supply of our colonial possessions, additional facilities will then be furnished, 'and inducements tendered to foreign as 'well as British capital, to collect in the 'depositories of Great Britain materials 'for every variety of traffic with every 'quarter of the world. It does not appear 'to your Committee, that so long as their 'own markets are preserved to them in the 'United Kingdom and its colonies, the 'free importation of articles of foreign 'manufacture, for re-exportation only, can 'affect the interests, or ought to excite the 'jealousy of our manufacturers.'

The Report of the House of Lords further states:—

'In so far as any alteration introduced 'is favourable to foreign trade, it must 'have a tendency to produce an increased 'importation from the north of Europe, 'and thereby possibly to induce an increased demand from that quarter for the 'manufactures of Great Britain; and your 'Committee are induced to believe that an 'increased demand would be the result, as 'well from the desire for British manufactures, that is said strongly to prevail 'in those countries, as from the extent to 'which the export of them has been maintained, notwithstanding the burthen imposed on the importation of this important 'branch of their produce into the United 'Kingdom.

'As our intercourse with the Northern 'States must be liable to be influenced by 'the fluctuations of political events, and as 'the exclusion from their ports, which has 'been once experienced, may at some future period recur, your Committee are 'apprehensive that the consequences of 'any measure that might have the effect of 'placing our dependence for a supply of 'timber exclusively on those countries, 'might become, eventually, the occasion 'of serious political inconvenience and 'danger, and, by the exclusion of competition, possibly defeat the expectation 'of comparative cheapness to the consumers 'of the country.'

These Committees may have been mistaken in their views, but the ablest advocates of the system were at least consistent in their opinions. The Report to which I have first alluded was worthy the great and powerful mind of Mr. Huskisson, and, in my judgment, should add to the respect we all feel for the memory of that great man. He knew that if these views had been adopted by other countries, if a more liberal system of commercial intercourse was pursued by foreign States, that this country would derive the greatest possible advantage from it; but, Sir, other nations were also aware of this, and, therefore, looking to their own interests, or, at least, to what they considered to be for their permanent advantage, they have uniformly declined to follow our example; for I have not been able to discover a single instance in which the gratuitous concessions made by this country have produced a corresponding liberality on the part of any of our commercial rivals.

I have never for a moment presumed to impugn the motives of Mr. Huskisson; indeed, I am willing to admit that the experiment was justifiable; but the principles of that right hon. Gentleman are not those of the noble Lord (Lord Althorp), nor of the Vice-President of the Board of Trade; for neither Mr. Huskisson, Lord Wallace, nor Lord Goderich, as I shall hereafter endeavour to show, entertained opinions in accordance with the measures recommended by the present Government.

In submitting this Motion to the House, I wish it to be understood, that it is not my object to throw any blame on the authors of the recent changes; I entertain too great a respect for the talents and ability of Mr. Huskisson, and other advocates of the system, to attempt it. No one can doubt the enlarged statesman-like views, and the patriotism of that great man, in the course of his public life. That right hon. Gentleman, the noble Lord, now Secretary for the Colonies, and Lord Wallace, then President of the Board of Trade, were the great promoters in this House of the relaxation of existing restrictions on foreign commerce and navigation; and in combating the views of the present Government, I am prepared to show, that they have proposed measures which neither Mr. Huskisson, Mr. Robinson, nor Mr. Wallace, ventured to contemplate. It is, in fact, because these principles have been carried much further than those who originally propounded them intended, that our trade and commerce have been, and are exposed to so much injury.

During the course of twelve years painful experience of a new policy, Parliament has invariably refused inquiry; and should the House persist in this course, without investigation, I shall feel considerable alarm for the consequences. It is now, therefore, after the system has been submitted to the test of experience, and its effects on the general welfare of the country fairly tried, that I venture once more to demand an inquiry. I am anxious for the appointment of a Committee, in order that facts may be elicited, to guide us in our future progress, that the speculations of political science, and the confident theories of individuals, however talented, may be subjected to the ordeal of a full and deliberate investigation.

In moving for the Committee, I shall avoid, as much as possible, going into a long statement of figures, and shall content myself with shortly referring to facts, which I believe to be incontrovertible and unanswerable, throwing upon the right hon. Gentleman the responsibility of a refusal, and the consequences that may result from the rejection of my Motion. I will venture to assert, that the arguments so confidently urged in this House by the right hon. Gentleman and others, and so implicitly relied on by Members, without inquiry, have proved anything but satisfactory to the country.

Originally it was proposed that some relaxation in our Navigation Laws, a partial change in our colonial system, and some alterations of our commercial policy had become expedient, in the altered state of commerce throughout the world; but I have been surprised to hear it asserted in this House, that many of the measures since brought forward, are in the slightest accordance with the principles recommended by the two Committees to which I have before referred. Bold assertions, unfortunately, have been taken for granted, though constantly disputed, and the consequences now are too apparent, in the declining state of our resources, and the general depression in all branches of trade.

For my own part, I consider experience a safer guide than any opinions, even those of the greatest authority; and I much fear the best interests and welfare of the country have been often sacrificed to mere theory. I have heard it said, with pain and regret, that I am the advocate of monopoly and restriction; but I must take leave to deny that I am favourable to any species of monopoly, or even of protection, that cannot be shown to be required for the encouragement of domestic industry, and the employment of the people. As an illustration of this argument, I would refer to the case of my own constituents. It is said by the advocates of the modern doctrine of free trade, "the case is one between the manufacturer, and the consumers of gloves. If the former suffers, it is for the benefit of the latter; and we see no reason why the wearer of gloves should buy a dear and inferior article at home, which can be procured better and cheaper from abroad;" but these supporters of abstract principles forget, that if we expose to a ruinous competition the interest of those who can only live by industry at home, by encouraging the importation of foreign commodities we shall have to support in idleness all that would be thrown out of employment by such a system of unfeeling policy. The advantages, therefore, of a foreign trade in manufactured articles, which we could ourselves produce, are ultimately prejudicial to the true interests of the country, by encouraging foreign labour, instead of fostering and supporting native industry. An interchange between producer and consumer at home, in which the capital and labour on both sides are British, must be more conducive to national prosperity, than such a trade carried on with foreigners, especially without reciprocity. It is not, however, my purpose to call upon the House to abandon hastily what has been done, by a repeal of existing statutes, but rather to recommend inquiry before we proceed further in the extension of this system. I call upon hon. Gentlemen not to aid and assist the present Government in the course which they appear disposed to adopt for the future regulation of our commerce. I will undertake to show, if a Committee be granted, that wherever the new system can be traced in its effects, it has most injuriously prejudiced the interests of those more immediately concerned, as well as those of the nation at large. At the same time, it must be admitted, that should we have reason to retrace our steps, we ought to proceed with great caution; for it may readily be imagined, that changes which had not been dictated by the greatest wisdom, might, perhaps, in some instances, be better adhered to than suddenly or hastily abandoned. My inquiries are retrospective, but my views are rather of a perspective nature. It is quite true, that we possess some advantages not enjoyed by other nations; but, together with such advantages, let it not be forgotten, that we have a superabundant and increasing population, wanting employment, and without the means of earning a subsistence by their own industry. The whole of my argument to-night, therefore, will be directed to prove the necessity of exercising the most vigilant guardianship and control over our own resources, with the view to promote national industry, and to improve the condition of the great mass of the people. I cannot but feel, that a persevering encouragement of foreign industry, to the prejudice of British labour, would still further accumulate the wealth of the country into the hands of a few individuals and great capitalists, instead of a more wholesome distribution amongst the productive and industrious classes. The national wealth may possibly be increased by the aggrandizement of those who are engaged in foreign trade, to whom a wide field of speculation is thrown open; but I contend, the bulk of the community is seriously injured, and the difficulties of the country augmented.

The London petition, to which I have before referred, states:—

'That the maxim of buying in the 'cheapest market, and selling in the 'dearest, which regulates every individual 'merchant in his own dealing, is strictly 'applicable, as the best rule for the trade 'of the whole nation; that a policy founded 'on these principles would render the 'commerce of the world an interchange of 'mutual advantage, and diffuse an increase 'of wealth and enjoyment amongst the in'habitants of each State.'*

Why, Sir, what is this but a mere truism? We may certainly "buy in the cheapest market," about which there was no dispute; but if foreign States, by fiscal regulations, shut us out from their consumption, it remains to be shown how we are to "sell in the dearest" without their consent. So far as past experience enables us to judge, the gratuitous concessions made by the present and former Governments, have entirely failed in accomplishing that object.

Again, the same petition goes on to state:—

'That a declaration against the anti-

---

* Hansard (new series), vol. i. p. 179.

'commercial principles of our restrictive 'system is of the more importance at the 'present juncture, inasmuch as in several 'instances of recent occurrence, the mer'chants and manufacturers in foreign 'States have assailed their respective go'vernments for further protective and pro'hibitory duties and regulations, urging 'the example and authority of this country, 'against which they are almost exclusively 'directed, as a sanction for the policy of 'such measures.

'That nothing would more tend to 'counteract the commercial hostility of 'foreign States, than the adoption of a more 'enlightened and more conciliatory policy 'on the part of this country. A great in'cidental object would be gained by the 'promulgation of a sound principle or 'standard, to which all subsequent ar'rangements might be referred, and by the 'salutary influence which a promulgation 'of such just views by the Legislature, 'and by the nation at large, could not fail 'to have on the policy of other States.'*

The measures and recent propositions of the noble Lord (Lord Althorp), have been in direct opposition to these principles. The noble Lord equalized the duty upon French and Portuguese wines, and proposes that Cape wine, the produce of our own colonies, shall pay the same duty as the finest wine of Burgundy, Champagne, and Bordeaux, without regard to their disproportionate value. He attempted also to alter the relative duties established by Act of Parliament, after deliberate inquiry, on Baltic and Colonial timber, with a view to its ultimate assimilation. Will it be contended that this was not going much further than Mr. Huskisson ever contemplated? Again, we have admitted the United States of North America to a participation in the benefits of our colonial trade, although they have not receded in the slightest degree from their restrictive measures; but, on the contrary, have increased the onerous duties existing in 1824 on our commerce and manufactures, by the almost prohibitory tariff of 1828.

I entertain, in common with every Member of this House, the greatest respect for the character and integrity of the noble Lord (Lord Althorp), but I must protest against the system of commercial policy which he has recommended, as most injurious to the best interests of the country; and I consider it most unsafe and impolitic that vessels of other nations should trade with the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain on the same footing as our own. I am not opposed to a *bona fide* system of liberal commercial policy, founded upon reciprocity, but I do object to the narrow application of those principles, and the partial mode in which they have hitherto been carried into effect. Neither do I complain of the course pursued by the French government; they are perfectly justified in adopting a defensive commercial policy; but I must deprecate concession after concession, without any proof, or even a reasonable probability, of any change of system on their part. I protest also against allowing the same advantages in our markets to those nations which virtually prohibit our manufactures, as to those which give us a monopoly, or a preference in theirs. The conduct of our Government, in equalizing the duties on wines of France and Portugal, shows that they are disposed to give equal facilities to the most hostile, as to the most friendly nation —a most unwise policy for a trading and commercial country, whose chief want is a vent for her surplus manufactures, which appears to be altogether overlooked: and when we turn to the new world, and contemplate the prospective benefits that might result from the cultivation of the vast resources they may hereafter be expected to afford, I consider this policy of the Government calculated to prejudice rather than advance our competition with rival States, seeking a participation in their commerce. Other nations pursue a directly opposite course; for, instead of yielding gratuitous advantages, and trusting to the liberality of their rivals, they proceed upon the plain and intelligible principle of mutual concession and actual reciprocity. An instance has lately occurred, in a Treaty between France and the United States, for a reduction of the duties on cotton wool by the former, and on French wines by the latter. Both these notions fully understand their own interests, and neither appear disposed to adopt the liberal principles recommended by modern theorists. On this subject I have conversed with merchants and manufacturers of great experience; and the result of my inquiries is a conviction that the experiment has failed. In proof of this, I must advert to other instances of the commercial policy of foreign nations.

---

* Hansard (new series), vol. i. p. 181.

I have already shown, that America, in 1828, increased her tariff of duties on British produce and manufactures, to an extent amounting, in many instances, almost to prohibition. The king of Prussia has lately imposed a heavy transit duty on British goods passing through his dominions; and on the 12th of November last, the emperor of Russia issued an ukase, imposing additional taxes on all our commodities. Where, then, are the proofs of a favourable change in the policy of foreign States, so often and so confidently predicted? In 1825, when Lord Goderich made a proposition for a great reduction in the duties on French wines, he said, that the great obstacle to a commercial intercourse with France were these duties, and that their reduction would induce that country to follow our example, by opening her markets to us; but I appeal to every one who hears me, if France has, in any one instance, done so? In vain have we reduced the duties and removed the restrictions on French produce and manufactures, and on the productions of other countries; instead of a more liberal policy having been adopted towards us, restrictive and prohibitory duties have been multiplied. As long ago as 1817, Lord Goderich said, the chief obstacle to a beneficial trade with France was, our restrictive system!

I admit that there are statesmen and merchants in France who seem disposed to favour a change of system; but the course pursued by the present Government, so far from promoting such a desirable change, is calculated to retard, if not to prevent it. For instance, whilst the importation of silks and of wines from France was either prohibited or discouraged, we had the influence of these powerful French interests with their own government, in aid of our endeavours to promote, on their part, a more liberal system of commercial policy towards this country; but by gratuitously admitting French manufactures at a moderate duty, and placing the wines of France and Portugal on the same footing, we have deprived ourselves of that influence, it being obvious that the manufacturers of Lyons, and the wine-growers, have no longer any motive to urge upon their government a change of policy by which they have nothing to gain.

I come now to a consideration of the alteration made in our Navigation laws—a most important branch of my subject. In 1822, a Committee was appointed, at the instance of Mr. Wallace, to inquire into the state of the Navigation laws; and I beg the House to remark what was said by him on going into the Committee on the Navigation Bill.

'If by the great principle of the Navi-
'gation laws was meant a due preference
'to British shipping in the trade of this
'country—if it was meant by these prin-
'ciples, that nations which had no ships
'of their own should send their commodi-
'ties to England in British vessels—if it
'was intended by these principles to pro-
'tect the direct trade with our colonies, and
'to maintain our coasting trade and fish-
'erie—if these points were to be secured
'by the principles of the Navigation laws
'—he cordially and perfectly agreed in
'their justice and propriety. These were
'principles from which he would not
'depart, and which he conceived ought to
'be maintained at all hazards.'*

Mr. Wallace, in 1821, had admitted, in common with all the ablest statesmen of former periods, that the importance of making this country the greatest maritime power in the world could not be over-rated; a sentiment which many seem disposed to rank with the exploded doctrines of ignorance and prejudice. But, Sir, we are confidently told, that the navigation of the country has increased since the late changes; and it is further contended, that this alleged increase is entirely owing to the alteration in our long-established policy for the protection of our shipping interests. I am, however, prepared to show, notwithstanding the references to documents, and official statements laid before this House, that the inferences drawn from them are extremely erroneous; and that, unless they are examined with a degree of care and attention which few Members have leisure or inclination to bestow on such complicated subjects, false conclusions may be easily drawn.

It will be in the recollection of the House, that the shipping interest have frequently endeavoured to promote an inquiry into that important branch of our national resources, alleging they were prepared to prove, that the effect of these changes had operated injuriously; and, although their case was advocated with great zeal and ability, supported by petitions from all the maritime towns in the kingdom, anxiously desiring to see that great arm of our national strength cherished and preserved, inquiry was constantly denied, and Parliament was induced to rely on the plausible statements brought forward by successive Governments to justify their own views.

---

* Hansard (new series), vol. vii. p. 711.

I recollect the speech of that able and powerful Minister, Mr. Huskisson; and when I call to mind the effect produced by that speech, I cannot but feel, that the House rather surrendered its judgment to the opinions of that distinguished man, than to the facts and arguments with which they were accompanied. Whatever respect I may feel for the memory of that talented individual, I must say, that in matters of such paramount importance, the assertions of any man, however authoritative, ought not to be implicitly received; but that it is our duty rather to look to facts, and to practical experience.

Figures upon figures have been brought forward for the purpose of defeating the numerous calls for investigation. It was impossible to remove the impressions made by such statements during a night's debate; their accuracy might be disputed, but rarely admitted of immediate refutation. Confidence in the Minister was a shorter road to a decision, than by a tedious and laborious investigation: and complaints were rejected, as emanating from interested, and, sometimes, from party motives. But, Sir, I am convinced, that, if inquiry had taken place, it must long since have become manifest, that the inferences thus hastily drawn from such statements, were erroneous; and that fallacies, difficult of detection during a hurried discussion, would have been refuted. Inquiry, however, was constantly denied: and many hon. Members, unaccustomed to the investigation of laborious details, thought the *dictum* of the Government sufficient ground for acquiescence in their decision.

Much reliance has been placed on the apparent increase of our foreign trade; but the documents on our Table prove, that this increase has arisen from the extension of our colonial commerce to new sources of trade, with the Brazils and South America, and to an augmentation with those nations with which we can have little or no competition.

To return, however, to the navigation of the country. I find, that the shipping employed in many foreign States has declined since 1826. The true test on this subject is not by a general reference to the entries inward and outward, because it must be obvious that this includes many short voyages made by the same vessel. The fair criterion is, the increase or decrease in the number and tonnage of our commercial marine. And here I will show, from official returns, that for some years there has been a decline in the number of ships built, and in the registered tonnage of the country; and it may be worth while to advert to the opinions expressed by Mr. Huskisson, in 1825. His language is clear and explicit, though little in accordance with the views of his successors. He says, 'All intercourse 'between the mother country and her 'colonies, whether direct or circuitous— 'and all intercourse of the colonies with 'each other, will be considered as a coasting trade, to be reserved entirely and absolutely to ourselves. By this arrangement, the foundation of our Navigation 'laws will be preserved, whilst the colonies will enjoy a free trade with foreign 'countries, without breaking in upon the 'great principle of those laws in respect 'to foreign trade—that the cargo must be 'the produce of the country to which the 'ship belongs. The importation of foreign goods into the colonies, I propose 'should be made subject to moderate duties; but such as may be found sufficient 'for the fair protection of our own productions of the like nature.'*

'Every step in this change will contribute to introduce a greater proportion 'and a better description of white population, and gradually to diffuse a true 'spirit of enterprise, not only in commerce, but in agriculture—to stimulate 'and endeavour to raise other productions '(indigo and silk, for example), besides 'sugar, which will increase the cultivation and wealth of those colonies; these 'arrangements will not only add to the 'value of property in this part of the 'world, but they will gradually ameliorate the moral condition of society, and 'by consequence, the internal security of 'those possessions.'†

The policy of the present Government appears to me, so far from being consonant with these opinions, to be directly at variance.

---

* Hansard (new series), vol. xii. p. 1108.

† Ibid. p. 1109.

The Returns in my hand show the number and tonnage of vessels built in the British Empire, during the last six years.

To 5th Jan.	Vessels.	Tonnage.
1826	1,719	206,636
1827	1,285	144,812
1828	1,474	166,396
1829	1,321	140,913
1830	1,140	116,872
1831	1,039	103,031
Shewing a decrease in Building, of	680	103,605

or nearly half the vessels, and more than half the tonnage, since 1826; or 136 vessels annually. And I find the vessels registered—

To 31st Dec.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Men.
1826	24,605	2,540,216	163,535
1830	22,297	2,429,999	147,018
——	2,308	110,217	16,517

decrease of registered tonnage, &c. since 1826, notwithstanding the increased trade of our own colonies, and to the Brazils, and South America, from which an addition might have been looked for.

Again, to prove the encroachment on our commercial marine by those States with which reciprocity treaties have been concluded, I will refer to the following table of British and Foreign tonnage entered inwards.

	1826.		1831.	
	British.	Foreign.	British.	Foreign.
Sweden	11,709	15,349	11,007	37,276
Norway	7,834	73,588	2,649	106,247
Denmark	22,650	56,544	6,552	62,190
Prussia	100,918	112,656	78,783	136,244
	143,111	258,137	98,991	341,957

Decrease of British	44,120
Increase of Foreign	83,820

Thus, Sir, I think it has been shown, that the boasted increase in the navigation of the country is fallacious, and that the Commercial tonnage of the State, on which it must depend for the support of the navy, has materially declined; and also, that those nations with which the mis-called reciprocity treaties exist, are gradually displacing British ships, by the employment of their own; a necessary consequence of the abandonment of all protection where such an inequality exists, and predicated at the time those changes were made.

I would not be understood to contend that the extraordinary maritime force of this country, acquired during a long and unexampled war, could be maintained during peace; but I submit, that the declension of our merchant marine has been greater than ought to have occurred, and that it is partly owing to unwise legislation.

With these brief and imperfect remarks, I must, for the present, dismiss this portion of my subject, which refers more immediately to the shipping interest, and proceed to inquire, how far the object of the Committee on foreign trade has been accomplished, in the extension and improvement of our foreign commerce.

I have always been convinced, that when Mr. Huskisson recommended these changes, he anticipated that other nations would follow our example; and it is not now necessary for me to argue whether or not the experiment was justifiable. But foreign States saw, or imagined at least, that their abandonment of a system of prohibition, or protection, of which we had given them the example, would be followed by an inundation of our cheaply manufactured goods; and that, although this might benefit their consumers, it would displace a large amount of domestic capital and labour, and permanently render them dependent on this country.

I shall not stop here to inquire into the soundness of these views; it is enough for me to show that our example has not been followed; and that, if we are to throw open our markets to cheap foreign manufactured goods, coming in competition with native capital and industry, it must, in future, be defended on other grounds than that of reciprocity.

The hon. member for Middlesex, it is true, carries his notions of free trade to an extravagant length. His maxim is—buy your goods at the cheapest market, without reference to their being produced at home or abroad, or whether imported in British or foreign vessels. This vicious principle has, I fear, been adopted by the noble Lord (Althorp) and his colleagues. Any thing more unsound, or untenable by argument, as applied to a country so peculiarly and artificially circumstanced as this, I cannot imagine.

The principles of free trade are, in themselves, good; but the question we have to consider is, the effect of their partial application by this country, in the absence of any concessions advantageous to our own commerce by foreign States. The hon. Member behind me (Mr. Hume), says, let us have free trade at any rate; but Mr. Huskisson does not appear to have been of that opinion, for when the American Tariff became a subject of discussion in this House, in 1828, he said, "that some means must be adopted by this country to meet and counteract that Tariff." He reminded us, that if America persevered in her hostile policy towards our commerce—if, whilst we took the raw material from her, she shut her ports against our manufactures, we must look for a future supply of cotton from the Brazils, from Egypt, and the East Indies —thus, evidently showing his opinion, that our conduct towards other nations should be regulated, in some degree, by theirs towards us;—these are his own words:—

'I make no remonstrance as to the 'principle; but we have the remedy 'within ourselves. I am, however, not 'disposed to enter into a war of restric- 'tions, or prohibitions in commerce. I 'deeply regret what has been done in this 'respect, agreeing, as I do, in this in- 'stance, in principle with my right hon. 'friend (Mr. Grant), on the silk trade of 'this country. Yet a man must be blind 'to the interests of this country, who 'would consent to deprive Government of 'the means of promptly meeting the ef- 'fect of such restrictive measures, by cor- 'responding regulations here. If we are 'not in a condition to assist ourselves, 'there is, at once, an end of all equality; 'nor can we account satisfactorily to other 'countries, with whom we are still allowed 'to trade on fair terms of reciprocity, for 'this tame endurance to injury. Neither 'is it consistent with the dignity of a 'great commercial nation like this, to sit 'in apathy, and affect not to feel the im- 'pediments thrown in the way of its com- 'merce. If we are to take the raw mate- 'rial for our manufactures from the 'United States, we certainly should en- 'sure for our articles, when manufactured 'from those materials, an equally favour- 'able reception in the market, as they ex- 'perience in other countries, not deriving 'in turn such considerable intercommer- 'cial advantages. Whilst we are depend- 'ent on that country for the raw mate- 'rial, are they to be encouraged and 'aided in their determination to be hence- 'forth independent of our manufactured 'goods, of which they have, till now, re- 'ceived so large a supply? It is a more 'manly course, in order both to assert the 'character and protect the commerce of 'the country, at once to protest against a 'system, framed for the unjust exclusion 'of our articles of manufacture. That 'system of commercial hostility I deeply 'regret. There are two descriptions of 'articles imported into this country— 'of the first class, such as tobacco, rice, 'and turpentine, I should speak as of 'articles which are not essential to our 'commerce or manufactures, and are mere 'articles of consumption. We can, I am 'satisfied, soon be supplied with tobacco 'from the East Indies, by wise and pru- 'dent inducements held out to induce its 'improved cultivation. The rice of India 'would soon, indeed it is already doing 'so, usurp the place in our list of imports, 'which that of Carolina has hitherto oc- 'cupied. In other articles the same 'change would soon be observed.

'With reference to cotton, the raw ma- 'terial is essential to our great staple 'trade; it is only necessary to give its 'culture in India the same encourage- 'ment and protection which the indigo 'trade has obtained, to ensure its cultiva- 'tion with equal success, and the growth 'of as good, as durable and as fine an 'article. The result would soon be, that 'the cotton of India would rival and sup- 'plant the cotton of the Western world, 'as the indigo of India already excels 'that of Guatimala, to which it was for- 'merly so much inferior, and would still 'have continued so, but for the judicious 'encouragement afforded to it. Unless 'we assert our dignity, and protect our in- 'terests, what will be thought of our 'apathy by the people of Brazil, who ad- 'mit all our articles of manufacture 'upon a payment of only fifteen per cent? 'What can we, with consistency, say to 'India, which is compelled to receive all 'our imports at two and a half per cent. 'on being landed in the ports of India, 'and have scarcely any staple wherewith 'to repay itself in the way of commerce 'with us? What, in fact, can be our 'answer to the States of South America? 'This is an important consideration; but 'there is another, which is, that if the 'United States pursue this course, and 'drive us to other countries for a supply, 'now almost all their own, we shall see 'that supply brought to this country in 'British bottoms, and thus employing 'British industry, instead of, as it is now, 'employing American ships and seamen.'*

But the ultra opinions of the hon. member for Middlesex were also combatted by the right hon. member for Tamworth, whom I am sorry not now to see in his place, that I might remind him of what he then said. The right hon. Gentleman remarked, and justly so, that the Tariff was not introduced as a measure of retaliation, but as a system of policy necessary for the encouragement of her own manufactures. As for the proposition which he had heard (from Mr. Hume), he did not see how it could be defended, and he protested against our Government holding out advantages to those States which gave none in return, all nations admitting that their own productions are entitled to peculiar privileges. He adds, 'but I think 'it right that other countries should un'derstand, that all nations admitting our 'productions should be entitled to addi'tional privileges in commercial inter'course over those countries that exclude 'us.'

I think, Sir, it has now been shown, that on the one hand, I have the support of Mr. Huskisson in favour of my opinion, that our commercial regulations with foreign States should be governed, in some measure, by their policy towards us; and, on the other hand, that the right hon. member for Tamworth formerly professed similar principles; but I may be told, that the foreign trade of the country has increased; this, indeed, has been the constant theme and unvarying argument. Let us, therefore, see in what direction it has extended, if it has not been with those countries which cannot compete with us in manufactures and with our own possessions. With Portugal, Spain, Italy, and some other European States, and also with the States of South America, Mexico, and the Brazils, an extension, altogether independent of the changes in our commercial policy since 1820. Has there been any increase in our exports to France, or those other countries that are pursuing a course of competition with England? No, they have diminished; for whilst our imports from France, since 1819, have trebled or quadrupled, our exports have decreased in almost as great a proportion. I, therefore, tell the right hon. Gentleman, that as long as France declines making any concessions to this country, the advantages are all on her side, and the disadvantages on ours.

The right hon. Gentleman, on a former occasion, said, that France had to sustain all the inconveniences of a circuitous mode of payment; but this is not correct. France is encouraged to bring her goods into our markets, and demand payment on the Royal Exchange, as she will take nothing in return; so that ours is the circuitous and forced trade of exports to distant markets, to obtain the means of payment; her's the direct. No doubt it will be said, that if we do not export to France, our manufactures will find a vent in other markets, from whence we obtain specie. This, in point of fact, is true; but the losses and sacrifices of our merchants and manufacturers, who are forced into a speculative trade, for want of steady and certain markets nearer home, are enormous. This, however, does not appear amongst the mass of figures extracted from the Customs' entries. The vast amount of exports, in official value, is held up to dazzle our eyes, and mislead the judgment, whilst the deplorable returns for those adventures, can only be gathered from the melancholy records of the *London Gazette.*

If we go on the Exchange, and other places of commercial resort, evidence of trade and commerce to a considerable extent will still be found, but with what ruinous consequences too often to the parties who successively engage in the hazardous pursuit of a purely speculative export trade. Undoubtedly, many of our merchants, with peculiar advantages, have realized, and some have retired with, large fortunes; but the general tendency of trade, for the last ten years, has been retrogressive. The noble Lord, however, lives in the constant anticipation of some favourable change in the policy of other States. The failure of all former predictions produce no change in his visionary schemes; and when, on a late occasion, I deprecated the proposed equalization of the duties on French and Portugal wines, the noble Lord said—we could not expect France would relax in her system of policy, unless we set her the example, though I reminded him we had already done so in 1825, and that six years had since elapsed without the fulfilment of any of the former predictions, so strong and so confidently made. Really this mode of dealing with important interests is trifling. The French government does not pretend that their policy depends on the course pursued by other nations; their system is sufficiently obvious, and its effects are decidedly disadvantageous to us. The Ministers of France say, "we admit your principles to be liberal, and, perhaps, if we were similarly circumstanced, we might adopt them; but you are inviting us into competition with your manufactures, which are half a century in advance of our own, therefore, we may be excused if we do not discover the promised advantages." This, also, is the language of the United States. I will not stop to argue if it is wise, but it is the language of Madison, Jefferson, Adams and Clay, men not inferior to our political enconomists, who consider it impolitic to render their country entirely dependent on foreign manufactures.

---

* Hansard (new series), vol. xix. p. 1770—1772.

That we are the first trading, commercial, and maritime nation in the world, is owing less, in my opinion, to the wisdom of the Legislature, than to the industry, energy, and skill of the people. I might almost say, that we have flourished in spite of some of the most ill-advised acts of legislation. Need I advert to the changes of late years, suddenly introduced without warning, without reason, and so fatal in their effects as to involve thousands in ruin?

In asking Government to direct their attention to facilitate the entrance of our manufactures into foreign markets, I am aware of its extreme difficulty; but the attempt has not fairly been tried. Concession after concession is made to other countries, but we demand nothing in return. In some instances, I am assured, that if stipulations had been made, they would have been granted; but it is thought more consistent with liberality to pursue the absurd and ridiculous policy of setting an example to foreign States, in hopes of their following it, rather than at once stipulating for a *quid pro quo.* That was not the course lately adopted by France and the United States, nations equally well informed with ourselves on commercial subjects, and better acquainted with the true principles of reciprocity. A treaty was last year concluded between those countries, by which the wines of France were introduced into the United States, at a reduced duty, in consideration of some advantages given to the admission of American cotton in the French markets.

I recollect the answer which Lord Castlereagh gave, some years ago, to a deputation, whose object was, to obtain from Spain conditions favourable to the commerce of this country, which had expended so much blood and treasure to effect the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty. The noble Lord said, "that he could not ask what was required, as he considered it unworthy a great nation like this, and unbecoming our magnanimity to make such stipulations." Had that Statesman lived to witness the practical effects of such quixotic doctrines, he would have seen cause to change his opinion. Foreigners take advantage of, and ridicule, but do not imitate our policy. We have the reputation of being liberal, good-natured, like many individuals in private life, whose folly and improvidence lead to ruin and bankruptcy, but procure for them the reputation of extreme good nature. This policy may be liberal, but it is unwise and unjust towards those who subsist only by their skill and industry; besides, it offers a premium to other governments who might be disposed to join us in a system of *bona fide* reciprocity. The peculiar state of this country, from the amount of its debt, and magnitude of its establishments, is strongly opposed to such a practice—it is impossible, whilst we are burthened to such an extent, that we can successfully compete with cheap nations. Can we import silks and gloves from France—linen from Germany—timber from Norway—sugar from Cuba and Brazils—and corn from Poland, for the benefit of the consumer, without prejudice to the producer of those articles at home, and in the colonies? The advantages, in particular cases, may preponderate, and the policy be justifiable; but to act rigidly and generally on such a principle, is utterly inconsistent with justice or feeling; and putting in jeopardy sources of national wealth long established, in search of some speculative and prospective advantage. The hon. member for Thetford, on a former occasion justly observed, that if we were to pursue the free-trade system, we must push it to its fullest extent; and I can tell country Gentlemen, who may be disposed to assist the Government in following out this system, the result must inevitably be a free-trade in corn; besides which we must have a Government as cheap as that of the United States, and an extinction of the National Debt. That things are tending that way I verily believe; and I can assure the House, that in combatting the principles avowed by the more ultra political economists, I do so because there is only a choice of evils. The noble Lord finds, and future Chancellors of the Exchequer must find, increased difficulties in bringing up the revenue to meet the expenditure.

My object chiefly in addressing the House this evening is, to implore Members no longer to take things for granted, even though backed by high authority; but, by the appointment of a Committee, fairly to ascertain on which side the truth lies, and what course we can follow in future with the greatest safety. I am neither an advocate for prohibition or protection to benefit particular classes. The interest of the community at large ought to be the paramount object of the Legislature. Much confusion of idea exists on this point; three sets of opinions are entertained—one, that protection is necessary, in particular cases, to sustain an important interest, which cannot be abandoned without material injury; another, that all protection is unsound in theory, and, therefore, indefensible in practice; and a third, that protection is only to be defended as applied to agriculture.

It cannot be doubted, that Mr. Huskisson modified his views as to the Corn laws; and yet he knew that, if the principles of free trade were strongly defensible, it must be when applied to corn; and, indeed, that our first steps on that system, if adopted, should have been in cheapening the articles of subsistence to the labourer; yet Mr. Huskisson, after the defeat of a bill in the other House of Parliament which he had advocated here, came down in the next Session, and supported a higher rate of duty, solely on grounds of expediency. Where then is the adherence to principles, so much dwelt upon by some Members?

The principal cause of distress in the manufacturing districts is, the want of foreign markets; and it is quite evident to me, that these are not to be enlarged or obtained by the policy of his Majesty's present advisers. They thought that foreign markets could be made accessible to British commerce, merely by a reduction of duties on foreign importations; but experience ought to have convinced them that such was not the case. Let them look to France, and they will find, that the admission of silk and other manufactures of that country, and the reduction of duty on her wines, had not only failed to produce any corresponding increase in our exports to that country, but that these exports are not now one-third what they were in 1817.

It has been said, among the absurdities of the new school, that the exports to any country were, necessarily, to a certain extent at least, dependent on the imports from that country; but nothing can be more untrue. The imports and exports almost exclusively depend on the facilities or discouragements offered to foreign commerce by foreign States. To illustrate this, I have compiled from the Finance Reports a table of comparative imports and exports in 1830, from five nations with which our exports vastly exceed the imports, and five other States with which the balance of trade is directly the reverse. By the latter table it is clearly seen, that the amount of our exports to France, Russia, Prussia, Turkey, and Spain, is not limited by our imports from those countries, and the difference can only be accounted for from other causes, chiefly the restrictive regulations against our trade.

Comparative Scale of Imports and Exports, 1830.

	Imports.	Exports.
Germany	1,669,365	9,467,092
Netherlands	1,978,114	4,956,116
Portugal	584,118	1,764,032
Italy	1,064,945	4,642,330
Brazil	1,488,271	6,155,271
	£6,784,813	£26,984,841
France	3,159,307	643,308
Prussia	1,027,367	705,815
Russia	3,442,653	2,753,887
Turkey	731,943	525,147
Spain	978,612	613,614
	£9,339,882	£5,241,771

I must again refer to France, for the purpose of shewing the sort of reciprocity experienced from that nation; and, to do this, it would be scarcely necessary to do more than allude to the struggle she has made, in maintaining a construction most unfair and injurious to our shipping, arising out of the Navigation Treaty of 1826, by which we have paid, since that period, nearly a quarter of a million sterling in our own wrong.

In 1820, our exports to France were 981,000*l.*; our imports 620,000*l.* In 1830, the former were only 846,000*l.*, though the latter had increased to 2,066,000*l.*; besides, what we take from her are chiefly articles of taste and luxury—silks, gloves, brandy, wines, &c., &c.; and those which her policy alone permits the introduction of from this country, are mostly colonial and East-India produce, wool, and machinery; the whole value of manufactured articles not exceeding 200,000*l.*, of which the four great British staples are—cotton, 6,000*l.*, woollens, 19,000*l.*, linens, 7,000*l.*, hardware and cutlery, 28,000*l.* This is the trade we carry on with thirty millions of people most contiguous to our shores; but the House will not be surprised when they learn that France encourages the free use of the raw material, and levies a prohibiting duty on foreign manufactures. I find, on inspecting the French tariff, not less than forty or fifty articles which are entirely prohibited. The result of this system is a gradual, though slow advance in her manufactures.

Dupin, a celebrated French statistical writer, has estimated the advance at the rate of four and a half per cent per annum.

The right hon. member for the Queen's County (Sir Henry Parnell), some time since, put a work into my hands on this subject, which I have read with great attention. He sets out with recommending both countries to commence a change of system, by the immediate and entire abolition of their existing tariffs. He then advises the admission of the raw material, and articles in the first stage of manufacture, free of any tax; and to establish a scale of duties, of which the maximum shall be ten per cent. It is scarcely worth while to argue on the merits of a plan which this Government cannot, and France will not, adopt.

A few words now on our trade with other countries. With the Netherlands, we carry on a beneficial commerce, which has considerably increased both in imports and exports since 1820; and our shipping enjoy a full share of the carrying trade between the two countries. The export of colonial produce is large; and, of manufactures, more than a million.

With Spain, Portugal, and Italy, our commerce is also extensive and advantageous, and with these States it is susceptible of great extension and improvement, under mutual encouragement and prudent regulations. I find, however, that Spain does not admit our vessels on the same terms as those of France, there being a discriminating duty in favour of Spanish vessels over those of all other countries, with the exception of France. This, I believe, is contrary to the treaties between the two nations, and I recommend the Government to look into the subject. The exports of Spain have increased from 700,000*l.*, to 1,800,000*l.*, since 1820, far exceeding the value of our imports. This trade is almost exclusively carried on in British vessels.

With Portugal our trade has been long established, and is highly advantageous, notwithstanding the interruptions to which it has been recently exposed by the political state of that country. Portugal consumes our manufactures almost exclusively, and employs our ships in the carrying trade between the two countries. We enjoy also peculiar privileges highly favourable to our Newfoundland fisheries, and to the employment of a large amount of British and colonial tonnage. Our exports to that country have increased nearly a million since 1820, whilst the imports have remained nearly stationary, at 450,000*l.* The exports of manufactures are very considerable—in cottons alone upwards of 500,000*l.*; woollens, 150,000*l.* I hope the commercial relations between the two kingdoms may not be permanently interrupted, as it is decidedly the best market we have, considering the extent of its population.

With Italy, our trade, both from its nature and extent, is highly beneficial; she supplies us with raw materials chiefly, to the extent of 900,000*l.*, whilst we export nearly five millions, of which, four millions consist of British and Irish produce and manufactures—one million in cottons, and a quarter of a million in woollens, are included in this amount. The carrying trade is almost entirely our own, and there is considerable commerce with the island of Newfoundland, highly beneficial to that colony.

Our trade with Russia is very extensive, notwithstanding the most severe restrictions on her part. Our imports have nearly doubled since 1820; but the exports, now amounting to three millions, have not increased in nearly the same proportion. With Russia, we enjoy the advantage of the principal carrying trade; but the whole commercial system of that empire is highly restrictive, and this has lately been increased by the ukase of the 23rd of November. As a proof of the tendency of this policy, I may mention, that our exports chiefly consist of colonial produce, and goods in transit from other States; whilst, with her population of sixty millions, we only send 100,000*l.* worth of woollens, and 24,000*l.* of cotton manufactures; but the article of cotton twist has rapidly advanced to 958,000*l.* The duties in Russia are enormous, and many articles of manufactures altogether prohibited.

I now come to our commerce with Prussia, respecting which much delusion has prevailed. This is one of the countries to which we have been looking for an increase of trade, by giving her advantages in her shipping and timber; but I shall show, that the direct trade with Prussia is inconsiderable in amount, and of comparative little advantage. The imports, indeed, for the last ten years, have increased from 587,000*l.* to 1,300,000*l.*; but our exports, notwithstanding, have dwindled from 974,000*l.* to 736,000*l.*, shewing a falling off, in the face of such increased imports, of nearly 250,000*l.* since 1820. What is this owing to but the discouragement of British commerce by Prussia, which she has lately increased by a further duty in transit of twelve and a half per cent. Out of this limited amount of exports to a country with a population of twelve millions, there is scarcely any manufactured articles; of cotton goods, except twist, only 175*l.* So much for the policy of further gratuitous encouragement to these States, to the detriment of our colonial trade, to which I shall come presently.

With Sweden, our whole exports is 157,000*l.*; a decrease of 2,000*l.* since 1820, and not exceeding the amount exported to one of our small West-India islands. There is scarcely 1,000*l.* of British manufactures; and why is this? Because Sweden prohibits many articles, and discourages the import of others by high duties.

With respect to Denmark, our exports, in 1830, were only 227,000*l.*, which is 60,000*l.* less than in 1820, though our imports from thence have advanced from 170,000*l.* to 404,000*l.* Danish ships enjoy more than double the carrying trade over British vessels. Her duties are enormous; and, amongst other onerous regulations existing in Denmark, I find that a person importing cotton manufactures into that country, is not allowed to send them to any consignee, but is obliged to put them into the King's store at Copenhagen, where they must be sold by auction, after a deduction of thirty per cent has been made in their value. This is a regulation which the Government would do well to get rid of, instead of giving further facilities to the importation of Danish timber.

I will now refer to an important branch of this subject—our trade with the United States of North America. On looking at the returns, I find there is an immense increase in the imports, the amount in 1820 being 2,800,000*l.*, and, in 1830, 6,200,000*l.*, without any proportionate increase in the exports. America—free and enlightened America—rejects our principles of free trade, and opposes her tariff to all the concessions we have hitherto made. We have, in my judgment, committed an egregious blunder in opening our West-India ports to the shipping of the United States spontaneously, and without any equivalent on her part. I know, of my own knowledge, that the American merchants had for years wished to get access to the British West-India colonies, because it was felt that the United States enjoyed peculiar facilities for supplying them with timber and provisions. Mr. Canning's memorable and masterly correspondence with the American minister on this subject is a model of British firmness and diplomatic talent, which the Government would have done well to imitate. He would not hear of any pretension to a trade with our colonies any more than to the coasting trade of the empire, and, therefore, it ought never to have been conceded; or, if admitted, we should have stipulated for a corresponding advantage, which might have been obtained. I know the policy of opening our West-India ports to the United States was adopted with the desire to afford relief to the drooping interests of those colonies. So far, therefore, the object was highly praiseworthy, for no other interest stands so much in need of assistance; but I contend that the late Ministers took an unwise course in giving the United States this advantage at the expense of our North American colonies. Surely it would have been better, instead of promoting the power and resources of a rival nation, to have encouraged a reciprocity of connexion between our own possessions, which would have led to an increase of our maritime strength by intercolonial communication. Relief, more direct and more substantial, might have been afforded to the West Indies, by a reduction of duties at home, without throwing into the hands of the United States an immense accession of tonnage, at the expense of the rising commerce of our own colonies which must inevitably result from such mistaken policy. Already, in fact, has the American marine received a great accession of strength and activity from this gratuitous concession.

Do I repine at this because of its advantage to the United States? Far from it. No one is more rejoiced than I am to see the prosperous condition of that country; but, that they should be permitted by us to thrive at the expense of England, does appear to me a most unnatural act on the part of the British Government.

The United States have no peculiar claims on us, while, on the other hand, our North American colonies have the strongest possible claims; and further, I will venture to assert, that these colonies, small as they are in the comparison, are more likely, under due encouragement, to afford a permanent market for our West-India produce than the United States. I know some hon. Gentlemen think, that the West Indies may enjoy the benefits of both markets; but this is a mistake. If the North American colonies are supplanted in the West Indies by the United States, they will not have it in their power to take their West-India produce.

To prove, in some degree, the relative value of those markets, it may be observed, that, in 1826, there was imported into the United States, from our West-India colonies, 24,000 cwt. of sugar, and, into our North American colonies, 44,000 cwt. There were also imported into the United States, 819,000 gallons of rum, and, into our North American colonies, 1,704,000 gallons; so that, it appears, those colonies, small as is their population, are greater consumers of those articles produced in our West-India islands than the United States. This arises from America producing both sugar and spirits in considerable quantity, and procuring them also from other markets, whilst Canada, and British North America derive their supplies wholly from our own colonies in the West Indies. The United States are, in fact, extending their large plantations in Louisiana, and are become exporters to Europe.

But we may be told, there are symptoms of a change in the policy of America, and that the tariff of 1828 has numerous and powerful opponents in that country. I have felt it my duty to obtain information on this point, and have in my possession some documents which enable me to speak with confidence on the subject. That some modifications in the existing tariff may take place, even during the present sitting of congress is highly probable, but there is little chance of such a reduction of duties as should procure for our manufactures any increase of consumption in the United States, because they, like France, possessing also every facility, are seeking to become a manufacturing nation. Take, for instance, the article of cotton (of which I have no very late returns), and we find that, in 1800, there were only 500 bales manufactured in the United States; in 1805, the number was 1,000,; in 1810, 10,000; in 1815, 90,000. Again, with respect to iron—I am informed there are 300,000 tons of bar and pig iron annually manufactured in the United States, the produce of which amounts to thirteen million dollars, eight millions of which are paid in wages to two hundred thousand persons, who find employment in their works. I am, therefore, warranted in believing, that the United States are not likely to admit British goods on such terms as to check their own manufactures, or to make that country dependent for future supplies on foreign markets. If they modify their tariff, it will be because they find the existing duties are no longer required to protect the present improved state of their manufactures; but they will take care to retain such duties as will effectually protect their own establishments.

A very inadequate idea exists in this country of the actual state of American manufactures, which took root and extended during the late war. It is said, that in a country where labour is so dear, no competition can be successfully maintained with this country; but we must not overlook the revolution which the extensive use and application of machinery has produced. Numbers, I am informed, are supplied with clothing entirely made in their own families. In this way does America not only contribute largely to its own demand, but actually exports manufactured articles to the extent of 8,000,000*l.*

annually; and some of our own colonies, which ought to depend on the mother country for such articles, are partially supplied with goods legally, or illicitly introduced by vessels from the United States, which, under the present system, are allowed a direct intercourse with the colonies.

Let us see how this system actually works. I find, by reference to some valuable works on American statistics, that, in 1827, the imports into the United States were as follows:—

In American vessels,	75 million dollars	..	980,000 tons.
Foreign Vessels,	4½ ditto	..	137,000 do.

It is true that America is prodigal in her amicable professions towards England. Even General Jackson, who was thought to be unfavourable to this country, has been equally profuse with his predecessors in expressions of good will. I do not undervalue such demonstrations of friendship on the part of a great nation, with so many claims on our amity and good will; but I must consider all such declarations acts of mere official courtesy, entitled only to a similar return, as long as they are unaccompanied by any practical proof of liberality. Whilst these are wanting, we ought to decline all concessions on our part.

There are many of the valuable productions of America which mainly depend on the British market for their consumption—tobacco, the staple of Virginia and Maryland—the rice of Carolina—and the cotton of South Carolina and Georgia; and it has been well observed, that America is more indebted to us than we are to the United States. The true interests of both countries, perhaps, would be best promoted by admitting the principles of free trade, and acting upon them, so far as they can be made consistent with justness and fair reciprocity. I shall conclude my observations on the United States with the following extracts from a Report of the Third Annual Fair of the American Institute of the City of New York, in October, 1830.

‘Cotton prints, in fineness, delicacy, and richness of colour, greatly surpass all former exhibitions; and other cotton goods have arrived nearly at perfection.’

‘The specimens of woollen cloths are not numerous, but in high perfection, particularly the two first premium pieces. They have not been outdone in this or any other country.’

‘The samples of iron and steel, in bars and rolls, afford proof that this great essential of civilization and improvement will, in a few years, be entirely supplied from our own resources. The castings from iron are equal to any ever imported, and defy foreign competition.’

‘Those who had been persuaded that we are too young a people to enter the career of competition with the other world, were satisfied that, though comparatively in infancy, our vigour, enterprize, and genius, have already accomplished results which have cost other nations centuries, and will soon enable us to distance them in the career of glory.’

Having made these remarks on the foreign trade of the country, I will take the liberty of offering some observations to the House on our colonial system.

I venture to contend, that the colonies have not been fairly treated, either by the present or by former Governments—that they have not received that consideration from the Legislature to which their value and importance fully entitle them. There is a class of politicians in this House (amongst whom the hon. member for Middlesex stands pre-eminent), who look at these portions of the British empire through no other medium than the annual votes of Parliament for the support of their civil and military expenditure; and who, seeing that sums of money are taken out of the pockets of the people to aid our colonial establishments, are tempted to exclaim, that all such colonies as cannot maintain themselves ought to be got rid of. This, however, in my judgment, is taking a narrow, and most erroneous view of the subject. The colonies are not justly chargeable with a great portion of the expense, neither created with their concurrence, nor for their benefit. Let us look at the extent and variety of these colonies and possessions—their value and importance to our shipping interest, and to our manufactures—am I not justified in declaring, that they are of incalculable advantage to this country, and that the loss of them would be a severe blow to the maritime power and resources of the State? If we look practically into this matter, we shall find, that the increase in our colonial consumption is enormous, and the value of this trade, with some of the compared European States, really astonishing. In the four great staples of our manufactures, I find the following results in our exports of 1828 :—

	To Foreign Parts.		To British Colonies and Possessions.
Cotton Manufactures	9,000,000	....	3,390,000
Woollen ditto	.. 3,400,000	....	1,400,000
Linen ditto	.. 1,300,000	....	778,000
Hardware & Cutlery	1,000,000	....	276,000

and of these foreign exports, the proportion to the Brazils, and South America, especially of cottons and linens, is very considerable.

I have already adverted to the policy of the noble Lord, in his proposed alterations of the timber duties; nor would I again allude to them, if I had not understood the noble Lord to say, that he still maintained the same opinion, and should be prepared, on a more favourable opportunity, to renew that proposition on which he was out-voted on a former occasion. I was sorry to hear this; for, though it is said there were circumstances connected with that discussion, which, perhaps, induce him to believe that he may be more successful another time, it appears to me, that it would have been more prudent to have acquiesced in that decision. The noble Lord may, perhaps, say, that if it had been more prudent, it would have been less candid. Most undoubtedly. I highly respect the noble Lord for that candour which has won for him golden opinions from both sides of the House; but it has produced this evil, that the uncertainty in which the trade is involved, paralyzes exertion, and checks the enterprise of the merchant, and shipowner. I tell the noble Lord, that he will do well to abandon his project; I deprecate, and he ought to deprecate, making this nation dependent on foreign States for a supply of timber. In the noble Lord's argument, there was this fallacy; he assumed, that, in withdrawing the protection afforded by the Legislature to colonial timber, we should continue to receive the same supply from that source, with the additional advantage of larger and cheaper supplies from the North of Europe. He also fell into another palpable error, by supposing, that, in drawing upon the Baltic for our chief supply, we should have the cheapness produced by the existing competition. Why, Sir, so great a mistake was this, that the mere proposition of a change of duties, had the effect of raising the price of foreign timber; and, if carried into effect, we should soon have discovered that the promised advantages would have been purely chimerical; and that we should not only have sacrificed a valuable and secure portion of our colonial trade, but that the shipping interest of the country would have been exposed to imminent danger. I cannot here forbear to quote the answer of the late Mr. Huskisson, in reply to the hon. member for Middlesex's proposal for a reduction of duty on Baltic timber, on a former occasion.

He said, ‘ Canadian timber, considering that it grows in one of our own colonies, and was transported in our own ships, was a most valuable trade to Great Britain; and as a further argument why the existing duties on other timber should not be further reduced, there was no trade which, by reason of increased demand, had lately attained a more improved and prosperous condition than the trade in Baltic timber.’

I may be wrong in my views, but I am supported by authority; and I find Lord Goderich, when he proposed the Colonial Trade Bill, in 1822, using still stronger language in favour of the claims of our North American colonies, which I will not trouble the House with quoting.

I lately took up a paper laid on our Table, which contained matter of the greatest importance in reference to this point. I allude to the Report made by Mr. Richards. I shall not venture to read it to the House; but I earnestly entreat Gentlemen who take an interest in this subject, to peruse what Mr. Richards says on the increasing trade and population of these colonies, as consumers of our manufactures; for I think he shows clearly and unanswerably the necessity of giving their produce every reasonable protection and encouragement in this country. I can tell the noble Lord, also, that the sentiments of his own colleague, to whom I have before alluded, the Secretary of State for the colonies, were opposed to his, for he said, in April, 1821 :—

‘ Our colonies, he conceived, ought rather to be considered as an integral part of the kingdom, than as an appendage, having only a remote interest in common with the mother country. As to the shipping interest, he trusted Parliament and the country, would never be so ungrateful as to forget, that to it we owed the glory of that navy—

> ‘ Whose flag had braved a thousand years,
> The battle and the breeze.’*

---

* Hansard, (new series), vol. v. p. 55.

The noble Lord, therefore, will perceive that he is not only at variance with one of his own colleague's recorded sentiments, but also with those of Mr. Huskisson's.

One of the great mistakes of the political economists is, that cheapness is the only desideratum; but it will be found, on close examination into the subject, that the tendency of their policy is to aggrandize and increase the wealth of an inconsiderable portion of the community, whilst it pauperizes the great body of the people.

Let us see how the case stands with our West Indian and North American trade. The imports from the former, in 1830, were 9,400,000*l.*—the exports 4,400,000*l.* The shipping employed in the same year, 249,000 tons outward, and an equal amount inward. From North America, the imports were 1,100,000*l.*—the exports 2,300,000*l.* The shipping trade (which, in 1821, was 1,403) had increased, in 1830, to 1,758; amounting to 480,200 tons. These exports, too, chiefly consisted of manufactured articles, of which I find from official documents, that the North American colonies alone take a larger amount in cotton, woollen, hardware, and cutlery, than Russia, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and France, altogether. Is this a commerce to be put in jeopardy by visionary theorists? Can we hazard a trade, estimated at 17,000,000*l.*, employing 700,000 tons of British shipping, without inquiry or any alleged necessity?—resources always available to the parent State, in peace and war, beyond the control of foreign legislation—affording employment for our redundant population at home, and encouraging the adventurous emigrant, who quits his home, to cling to his native country in a distant portion of her vast empire, rather than add to the power and influence of a foreign, and, perhaps, rival nation. It may be questioned, if the establishment of so widely an extended colonial system was dictated by sound policy, but the abandonment of it now, and the consequent augmentation of the resources of other States, jealous of our power, would be an act of national suicide.

Lord Sheffield said, "The only advantage of the colonies, is the monopoly of their consumption, and the carriage of their produce." If I do not entirely agree in this maxim, I am clearly of opinion, that, if we surrender to foreign states the trade of the colonies, they then become useless and burthensome appendages to the Crown.

The advocates of our modern commercial policy take credit to themselves for an increase in our commerce and navigation, supported by a general mass of figures; but the fact is, that trade has not increased with those states with which it was their object to promote an intercourse; and it is owing to the growing prosperity of our North American colonies, and to the new trade with the Brazils, and South America, that we are not now in a much worse condition.

I must, especially, deprecate the power delegated to the Crown, of admitting the ships of other countries into our colonies, on an equal footing with our own, provided such countries give us a similar privilege. Few of these nations have any colonies; there could be no reciprocity but in name; and it was under this pretence that America obtained her long cherished object, of a direct trade with our West-Indian islands. This, I own, appears to me a fatal error; and I do trust, when the Reciprocity Act expires, such a power will never again be delegated by Parliament to the executive Government. But, Sir, besides this immense trade direct with our colonies and possessions abroad, is the House aware (in the absence of any Returns on the subject) of the extent and value of our inter-colonial trade, which gives such an accession to the maritime power and resources of the State? If they were—if all these things were fully and dispassionately investigated—no one could look upon those colonies as an encumbrance to the mother country. I admit, there is much in the colonial system that requires revision; in such a revision, and in the promotion of general improvement, I believe the colonists themselves are cordially disposed to co-operate with the executive Government. Amongst the King's subjects, none are more devoted to the Crown than the British colonists—I can answer, especially, for North America, having lived amongst some of them. Their devotion has not only never been doubted, but it has stood the test of many a severe trial; and it is with great pain that they have heard expressions made use of in this House, in derogation of their value and importance to the parent state—and this, too, in high quarters, from whence more guarded language might have been expected. I do not believe that there can be any desire on the part of the Government to injure the colonies, but there certainly is a party in the House (not very numerous, but who are persevering), disposed to hurry Ministers into projects incompatible with the welfare of the colonies, and injurious to the permanent interest of the nation—a party, whose main argument is, that no distinction ought to be made in dealing with our own possessions, and foreign states; and who further contend, that our intercourse with foreigners is to be regulated without any reference to their conduct towards us. Hon. Gentlemen may, if they please, continue to proclaim the inutility of the colonies; all I can say is, that I do not envy the narrow and contracted views of those who entertain such opinions; and still more must I deprecate there being in the councils of the King, individuals who suffer themselves to be so deluded.

In spite of all such attempts, however, I trust a good understanding will continue to exist between England and her colonies. I know the sound part of our population are attached to their colonial fellow-subjects, and I also know, that a similar feeling exists in the colonies; and, therefore, I must ever denounce any attempt to weaken or impair those ties, the maintenance of which are of so much importance to both.

I now come to the last branch of my subject, the state of our Home Trade and Manufactures. Of these, however important, I feel, after the time already occupied in this discussion, I can only venture to offer a brief sketch.

I can readily believe, that the changes recently made in our commercial policy were dictated by a sincere desire to promote the interest of our domestic trade and manufactures. I have formed this opinion, because, at the time they were proposed, the most confident predictions to that effect were made, and, therefore, I am warranted in asking the House to inquire into our present condition at home, as compared with the year 1820, when the alterations in our commercial policy commenced. It is not incumbent on me to prove, that the present depressed condition of the trade and commerce of England has been occasioned altogether, or even in a material degree, by these changes; it is enough for me to be able to show that the predictions so confidently made, and so readily assented to in this House, have not been verified, and that the general state of our trade, and the condition of the labourer, is worse than at any former period of our history. I have heard this state of things attributed, at different periods, to temporary causes; at one time a severe winter, at another a bad harvest, at another the cholera, and lastly, to the Reform Question; but I do most sincerely believe, that the cause of the depression is far more deeply seated, and that the trade of the country has been retrograding, with occasional intermissions, from the year 1820 to the present period. I feel, therefore, warranted in saying, that the effect of these changes has not been more beneficial in our home than in our foreign trade; but what I wish more particularly to impress on the House is, that we have, throughout, under-rated the vast advantages which this country enjoys over every other in our internal trade, and in our colonial intercourse, which we have too much neglected, in the vain pursuit of a speculative and uncertain commerce with foreigners, that, in its nature, must be precarious, and liable to constant interruption. Do I, therefore, ask his Majesty's Ministers to abandon the idea of cultivating the most friendly commercial relations with foreign states? Far from it; but I wish to convince them that our main object should be, the cultivation and support of our national resources, and their careful preservation, by wholesome regulations, against the injurious effects of foreign competition, when protection is found to be absolutely necessary. This has been the policy pursued by this country in other, if I may not say in better, times, during years and centuries. In that course we ought to persevere, subject only to such changes and modifications as the altered state of things may require. I am not likely to deny the utility and importance of foreign commerce to a country like this; but when put in comparison with our home and colonial trade, it is utterly insignificant; besides, with foreign states, we must always enjoy an extensive commerce, and it is no less their interest than ours to continue it. I have no apprehension that these governments can in future pursue a more illiberal course of policy than they do at present; they act from no spirit of direct hostility, but with a view to their own benefit; and that being the case, we must be prepared, as I believe Mr. Huskisson was at last, to see them persevere in their present system. Alterations, indeed, may be effected by time and circumstances; mutual concessions, by treaty, founded on reciprocal benefits, may take place, but hon. Gentlemen opposite appear to ridicule the idea of stipulating for advantages in return for concessions on our part. Their policy is, to give freely, and to hope constantly; and, absurd as such an idea is in itself, it is rendered doubly so, when persevered in after twelve years of utter failure and disappointment. Let us, then, look chiefly to our own resources, and to the means of improving and extending them; by such means only, can we avoid difficulties still greater than those under which we now labour. Let us no longer be deluded by official declarations of increasing prosperity, amidst the most appalling evidence of general distress: true it is, that in 1819, our exports, in official value, amounted only to 41,960,555*l.*, and that, in 1830, they had increased to 55,465,723*l.*; but we were not informed that the real value, the criterion by which alone the prosperity of the trade could be decided, had fallen off, during the same period, from 45,180,150*l.* to 35,212,873*l.* The increase of thirteen millions, in official value, deluded Parliament and the country, whilst an actual decrease of nearly ten millions, or a diminution of 23,472,445*l.* in our exports, for the last eleven years, was entirely overlooked. By Mr. Alderman Waithman's tables there appears a gross decrease, in the real value of our exports in fifteen years, of 116 millions. Can we, then, any longer wonder at the depressed condition of our home trade or manufactures, when we find such an abstraction from the amount of capital by which the manufacturer receives his returns, and from which the labourer looks for his wages?

To form a just conception of the importance of our home trade, we may consult the elaborate Treatise on the British Empire, by Colquhoun, in 1814. Sir Frederick Eden supposed that the annual consumption of British manufactures at home was seventy-six millions, and the annual produce of agricultural labour might be computed at 216 millions, and of the manufactures, after deducting the raw material, 114 millions. This may give us some idea of the magnitude of our internal commerce, by means of improved internal communication, and of the coasting trade, which probably admit of a much greater extension, from the extraordinary discoveries of modern times.

Of the power and effect of machinery a great deal might be said, both as regards the increase and improvement of our manufactures, and the condition of the labourer, but I can only glance at the subject. Dupin has calculated that the introduction of machinery has equalled the employment of 6,400,000 able-bodied labourers. The effect of all this has been stupendous; our eyes have been dazzled, and our judgments perverted, by the ostentatious displays of wealth and magnificence which surround us; but, in the mean time, the canker, which is silently eating into the core of the nation, is undermining the root of our prosperity. The increase of pauperism and of crime afford melancholy proofs that the true evidence of national soundness and vigour is wanting. The increase of poor-rates, the declension of our revenue, the augmented number of criminal commitments, speak a language not to be misunderstood. I see by the Returns made to this House, that there has been an increase of commitments for criminal offences, between 1820 and 1831, of about 6,000, there being at the former period 13,710, and at the latter upwards of 19,000. A further proof of the altered condition of the country may be found on referring to the Savings Banks. In the course of the three months previous to December last year, the sales on account of Savings Banks amounted to 317,000*l.*, whilst the stock bought in on their account amounted only to 36,000*l.* Can we be mistaken in looking at these indications of pressure and national decline, rather than blindly to rely on fanciful theories, and speculations based on no solid foundation?

Amongst other causes to which our difficulties have been attributed, is the return to cash payments. There can, indeed, be no doubt that the sudden adoption of an unmitigated gold standard in 1819, followed, as it was, by the entire suppression of small notes in 1826, had the effect of greatly augmenting the embarrassments of the country, much beyond what was contemplated by those who effected these alterations.

It is no part of my proposition to show that the whole system of currency and banking requires revision. When we are relieved from the pressure of the Reform Bills, which has suspended all the ordinary business of the Legislature, I trust these and other matters, upon which the future welfare of the country materially depends, will be minutely investigated, and receive due attention. I cannot, however, avoid expressing my doubts of the wisdom of that policy which entirely suppressed the circulation of small notes. That evil arose out of an unrestricted emission of paper, for the payment of which the public had no adequate security, will, I believe, be generally admitted; but regulation would have been a less questionable policy than an utter prohibition in this part of the United Kingdom, whilst the free circulation is permitted in Scotland and in Ireland. All these considerations will force themselves on the notice of the Legislature very shortly, and we may indulge a hope that the evils under which we now suffer may admit of remedy or alleviation.

A fatal error lies at the bottom of our modern economist's favourite theory, that national wealth is the great desideratum; they overlook the more important consideration of the causes that influence the welfare and happiness of the people, the encouragement of industry, the progress of civilization, and political power. They look too directly and exclusively at the supposed effect of their policy on prices, and disregard its operation on the moral character and permanent welfare of the people as a community.

Cheap prices in itself is doubtless an advantage; but greatly to lower the value of those articles from which the labourer receives his means of support, is to deteriorate his condition, especially if accompanied with dear food and heavy taxation.

Whilst we endeavour to cultivate and improve our commercial, trading, and agricultural resources, we must not lose sight of the absolute necessity of curtailing our disproportionate public establishments. I find that the whole civil, military, and naval establishments of the United States of America, are less in amount than the mere cost of collecting our taxes, and in the course of a short time the Americans calculate, that the public debt being paid off, they shall not require more than thirteen millions of dollars to defray all the expenses of the Government.

Compare such a state of things with our own, imposts scarcely to be felt, with a taxation of 52,700,000*l.* and 7,000,000*l.* poor-rates, annually, besides, an enormous tax on the consumers of bread, by the operation of the Corn laws.

I must beg pardon for having occupied so large a portion of your time. I do not call on the House to pronounce any opinion, feeling my own incompetency to deal with the great interests whose leading features I have merely sketched out; but, in bringing it forward, I may elicit from others more competent, opinions to guide us in our future proceedings. My object has not been to cast obloquy on any Government, or any individual; neither have I pertinaciously set up opinions of my own in opposition to others; but I have endeavoured honestly, though feebly, to impress on the House the conviction that for many years we have been pursuing a course of commercial policy, doubtful, if not dangerous, in its operation; that we ought, in future, to be guided rather by experience, than by the opinions of a few individuals, however distinguished by talent, or supported by authority. I hope and trust, therefore, that no other advances will be made in furtherance of this policy, without a solemn inquiry by the Legislature into the results of past experience, results by which we may be able accurately to measure the value of these declarations and arguments, which have been constantly brought forward, and a repetition of which we may expect to hear this evening. If the result of such an investigation should prove the wisdom and success of the new system, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that we are justified in its continuance; we shall no longer be liable to the reproach of refusing to listen to the urgent entreaties made to this House for Inquiry—entreaties which I once more second, by my present Motion, for a Committee of Inquiry into the effects produced by the altered policy of the country since 1820.

I may be told, that it is an inconvenient period to grant such a Committee; that the House is engaged in other investigations, and that the Session is far advanced? I admit that such is the case, but this is too important a subject to be longer delayed; and I fear those who may be Members of the next Parliament, will find their time so fully occupied as to afford little additional leisure. Hon. Members, too, will allow me to say, when they speak of the advanced state of the Session, that there are documents in the library of the House sufficient to enable a Committee of Inquiry to come to a just decision on this subject, without calling for further evidence, the examination of which would occupy much time.

Thanking the House most cordially for the very kind indulgence and attention I have experienced, I conclude, by moving,—

"That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the present state of our Trade, Commerce, and Navigation, and specially to investigate and report upon the practical operation of the changes in our Navigation Laws, and Commercial Policy, since the year 1820, with a view to promote domestic industry, and to improve those national resources, by which alone the prosperity and stability of the British Empire can be maintained."

Mr. *Pigott* seconded the Motion. He thought that such an inquiry was imperatively called for. The abolition of protecting duties was avowedly the principle upon which his Majesty's Government proceeded. Their main object seemed to be, to foster the trade between this country and France. The right hon. Baronet, the member for the Queen's County, had said some time ago, and the noble Lord opposite had more recently repeated, that no two countries were better calculated to carry on an extensive trade than England and France. Although he had great respect for their opinions, he must beg leave to dissent from this proposition. Both countries were populous and wealthy; but their wants and their superfluities were nearly the same, and their commercial intercourse could never be in proportion to their wealth and population. It was to countries abounding in raw materials that both must look for a market for the produce of their industry and their ingenuity. Such markets we possessed in Portugal, and in our colonies; and it ought to be our policy to turn them to advantage, instead of indulging the fallacious hopes of a beneficial commerce with France. He could mention a few facts to support the view which he took of this subject. It appeared that in January 1831, our imports from France amounted to 1-22nd part of the whole of our imports—while our exports to France formed only 1-81st part of our whole exports. There was another point, of still greater importance even than the difference of amount between our imports from France and our exports to it, and the smallness of their amount as compared to our whole trade—namely, the different qualities of the articles which we exported to France, and those which we imported from thence. The greater part of our imports from France were articles of pure luxury—such as wines, silks, and perfumery. Most of them were articles the superiority of which depended upon caprice and fashion, rather than upon any intrinsic advantage which they possessed over articles produced in England. The articles which we sent to France (according to the returns for January, 1826, which he selected because there had been no detailed returns since) were classed under 111 heads, the declared value being 1,171,000*l.* There were only seven of these heads which were of any importance, and they amounted to two-thirds of the whole. There was, in the first place, cotton wool, which amounted to 290,000*l.*, or one-fourth of the whole—indigo, raw silk, rough saltpetre, machinery and coals. Now it could be easily perceived that these materials gave France the means of increased employment for her population, and gave her a great advantage over us in foreign markets. But what did France take of our staple manufactures? He would take the most important of all—cotton. The total export of manufactured cotton wool to all parts of the world, from 1818 to 1828, amounted to 152,956,000*l.* And what proportion of that had France taken? She had taken but 106,042*l.* being 1-220th part of what was exported to the United States, 1-160th part of what was sent to Italy, and only 1-76th part (with her thirty millions of people) of what was consumed by Portugal. In the present condition of our trade, therefore, he thought an inquiry extremely desirable, and he cordially seconded the Motion.

Mr. *Hume* thought himself called on, by the reference made to him by the hon. Member (Mr. Robinson), as if he were one of those ultra-political economists, who, out of love to theory, were opposed to the wishes of all the practical commercial men in the country. The hon. Member only made assertions and assumptions: he begged leave to call the attention of the hon. Member to the declared opinions of the merchants of London, as presented to that House, and enforced by the hon. member for Thetford. He would rely on that authority to show the incorrectness of the hon. Member. It was curious enough that the hon. Member had described all the returns as erroneous, and as unworthy of any reliance, and at the same time the hon. Member had not advanced one fact to support his assertions but what he had borrowed from those returns. He had brought forward no evidence whatever to support his views as to the impolicy of our present regulations. He agreed with the hon. Member, that it would be most beneficial to extend our commerce; but he thought, that not only our domestic, but our foreign commerce should be extended. He would encourage and promote all and every branch equally, and as much as possible. As to our colonial policy, he thought that the course pursued had been most erroneous. We had been pitting one colony against another, and ruining one for the sake of another. With regard to foreign commerce, he thought it should be left to those concerned in it, and he should be glad to see it flourish. The hon. Member ascribed all the evils we suffered to free trade. Why, we had no free trade. All our limbs were bound and fettered, and not one motion was free. The hon. Member admitted, that prohibition, restriction, and protecting duties, were evils of themselves, and yet the hon. Gentleman's whole speech was intended to advocate prohibition, restriction, and protecting duties. Where did the free trade of which the hon. Gentleman spoke exist? When the hon. Gentleman said, that he (Mr. Hume) was advocating opinions opposed to the commercial community, he begged leave again to remind him of the great meeting at the Egyptian Hall, and the petition presented by the hon. member for Thetford, which he should never forget. He was sorry that the hon. member for Bramber, who then supported that petition, was not present, as he could tell the hon. Member, that the Government with which he found fault, had only followed the recommendations of the merchants of London. After that great meeting, and elaborate petition, what did the Government do? Did it act immediately? No; it appointed a Committee, which sate for three years, and examined all sorts of practical men. The Government also moved for the appointment of a Committee of the House of Peers, which was granted, and which examined practical men from all parts of the empire. These Committees recommended an alteration in the Wine and the Timber Duties; and there was nothing he admired more in the noble Lord opposite (Lord Althorp) than the bold and manly manner in which he brought forward those subjects. The hon. Member described those measures as failures, and spoke of them as defeats; but how was the noble Lord defeated? By a union of those who were pledged to these measures; and the hon. Member was himself one of those who united to thwart the noble Lord. That opposition was got up for factious and party purposes. He was surprised to hear the hon. Member wish for additional restrictions. Why, there was not one species of raw material, one species of trade, which had not been exposed to restrictions, as if the Legislature had studied to limit the industry of the country. The hon. Member had selected silk as a specimen of the injury done to our manufactures by free trade. Why, this free trade was yet encumbered by a duty of from thirty to seventy per cent. The hon. Member wanted to keep prices high, because we had high taxes; but, because the taxes were high, he was of opinion that the people should get everything they used or consumed at as low a rate as possible. According to this view, he had always been of opinion that we ought to get our corn as cheap as possible. He had always advocated the removal of the Corn laws on that ground. Cheap food was essential to us; precisely because we had such enormous taxes to pay. If the Corn laws were abolished, a general equality of price would be the consequence; and the price would fall here, and rise on the Continent. That would lower the price of our manufactured articles also to a small amount, and create a demand for them abroad, which would be a great benefit to the country. The hon. Member had observed, that when we were about to lower the duties on timber, the price of Baltic timber rose. Did he not suppose that would be the case with corn? Or had the hon. Member two rules of trade —one for corn and one for timber? The same rule was applicable to all articles; and corn, if allowed to be imported here, would rise in price abroad. The hon. Member mistook facts for principles, and bewildered himself by drawing inferences from single facts. The hon. Member had mistaken the meaning of the Reciprocity Act, and confounded trade with navigation. What was the origin of that Act? Why, Prussia declared, that if we did not, within a certain time, admit her vessels into our ports on the same terms as our own, she would lay heavy duties on our shipping. Where Prussia had one vessel, England, however, had three; and Mr. Huskisson, therefore, recommended that the ships of foreigners should be placed on the same footing as English ships, provided English ships were placed on the same footing as the ships of those foreign nations. That was the object of the Reciprocity Act, and as England had more ships than any other nation, the advantage was all on her side. If, for example, our ships were admitted into foreign ports at 1*s.* a ton, then the ships belonging to those ports were to be admitted into our ports at 1*s.* a ton. By that Act, then, we gained advantage in proportion to our extent of tonnage. He approved of that Act, and of the statesmanlike views by which it was dictated. Let it be remembered, that no foreigners were admitted to the advantages of this Act who did not comply with its conditions, and admit our ships into their ports on reciprocal terms. The hon. Member had objected also to our admitting articles from France. In his (Mr. Hume's) opinion we did not admit enough. If the mutual exchange between the two countries could be extended, it would be for their mutual advantage. Both nations would be benefited by that. The hon. Member said, France would not let our goods into that country; but if France would not let our cottons in at 6*d.* a yard, and made her people pay 9*d.* for them, thus encouraging smuggling, was that any reason why the Government of England should not allow the English people to consume French wine, and the other produce of France, at as cheap a rate as they could be procured? He maintained that the Government was bound to suffer the importation of such articles, even where no apparent reciprocity took place. Although France would not admit our produce, still it would be to our advantage to admit hers. The hon. Member had asked, how were we to pay them? That was their look-out; but, in point of fact, the produce of France so imported would necessarily be paid in goods manufactured in this country. If the hon. Member referred to one branch of trade only, it was possible he might prove that branch had sustained some loss, but it was the duty of that House to look to the general interests of the commerce of the country. Whether there was any reciprocity or not, it was the duty of the Government to let the people get goods as cheap as possible, and, therefore, to admit them without any prohibitory duty. In speaking of prohibitory duty, however, he did not include that portion of duty by which the revenue was to be raised, but only those duties which were called protecting, but which were, in point of fact, prohibitory. Every such law was injurious to the interests of the community, and ought to be put an end to. The hon. Member had referred to the conduct of the United States on the subject of the tariff, but he could tell the hon. Member something about the state of opinion in America on this subject according to the latest arrivals. The tariff had been found not beneficial but injurious, mercantile conventions had been held at Philadelphia and Baltimore, to consider the propriety of altering the tariff; and it was decided upon, even by those of the most ultra opinions, even by those who were desirous of keeping up the Tariff to the highest point, that it must be lowered, and it would be lowered in the course of the next Session. It was found also by a Committee of the Congress, that by the course which America had been adopting, she was sacrificing the best resources of a young country, and had been acting in opposition to the best principles of commercial intercourse. The American shipping had fallen off, whilst ours, in consequence of our acting on a more liberal plan, had increased from nine to fifteen per cent. The hon. Member had also referred to the conduct of France, but he could tell the hon. Member that, according to a valuable Report of a Committee on the wine-trade in France, prohibition had been found as delusive, and injurious there as here. That Report showed that similar opinions prevailed in France, amongst the most enlightened of the merchants, as prevailed here. The doctrine of prohibition was, to sell to foreign nations, but never to buy; just as if commerce did not depend on the benefits resulting from mutual exchange of the produce of different countries. He denied that trade had fallen off; but it should be remembered that they must not look at the interests of merchants exclusively, but take into consideration the other classes of the community. He should not follow the hon.

Member into his remarks on the subject of the colonies (in many of which he agreed), for that was not the time to consider the question; he had always objected to the enormous expense of our colonies, which did not benefit them, and rendered them a positive burthen to the mother country. Neither would he go into the subject of the decrease of prices; but he would observe, that he considered low prices a blessing, and as a means of relief from the enormous load of taxation by which we were burthened. It was a mistake to look to gold only; if he were to cram the hon. Member with gold, he would not be half so happy or so well off as if he were to cram him with corn or other articles. The hon. Gentleman had made use of a strange argument; he had said, that it increased crime and pauperism—that crime and pauperism had increased in a direct ratio as prices had decreased. It certainly ought to be the reverse, for, as the means of enjoyment were brought more within the reach of the poorer classes, the more was the inducement to crime diminished. The hon. Member was wrong in the statements which he had made in reference to the opinions which had fallen from him (Mr. Hume), when the petition from the merchants of London was presented in 1820. He was ready, if it were necessary or proper, to defend the line of argument which he then pursued, but he would not waste the time of the House with merely personal remarks. With respect to the hon. Member's Motion, he for one should object to the inquiry sought for, lest it should hold out to the country some ground for believing that they were about to return to the old and evil system. There was nothing to call upon them for such an inquiry; they had no petitions from merchants or others on their Table, and he thought it the duty of the House to discourage every attempt to return to a system which had been so ruinous as that from which they had now happily escaped.

Mr. *Wolryche Whitmore* said, that, after the able exposition of the hon. member for Middlesex of the fallacious arguments of the hon. Members who had originated and seconded the present Motion, he should have felt it unnecessary to trouble the House with any observations, had he not considered it necessary to draw their attention to one important subject, which had been made a topic of the speech of the hon. member for Worcester, but which had been overlooked in the able reply which had been made to that speech. The hon. Member who moved for the Committee, and the hon. Member who seconded the Motion, had both of them laid it down as an absolute fact, that the trade and commerce of the country had been constantly on the decline for the last twelve years. Now, if there was ever a proposition advanced which was calculated to deceive the House and the country, it was that assertion. So far was such from being the fact, that, for the last forty or fifty years, the trade of the kingdom had been increasing according to certain ratios, which ratios themselves had increased instead of diminished since the year 1820. If they looked at the records of the official value of the exports from England, commencing with the year 1790, the following would be found to be the condition in which those exports had stood at the several intervals of ten years. From the year 1790 to 1799, the official value of the exports amounted to 17,000,000*l.* annually; from 1800 to 1809, the official value of the exports amounted to 26,000,000*l.* being an increase during that period of 9,000,000*l.*; from the year 1810 to 1820, the official value was 36,000,000*l.*, being an increase upon the preceding ten years of 10,000,000*l.* and, from the year 1820 to 1830 the official value of the exports amounted to 48,000,000*l.*, being an increase of no less than 12,000,000*l.* The ratio also was, during the whole of this period, on the rise, not on the decline, as had been stated, and, that it was still greatly increased since the year 1830 was clear from the fact, that the official value of that year, and of the year 1831 was no less than 60,000,000*l.* for each year. The hon. Members who made and seconded the motion for a Committee had declared it to be their opinion that, because the declared value of the exports had not increased but had diminished, the trade of the country was, so far from being on the increase, actually in a declining condition. Now this opinion was altogether founded on a fallacious view of the matter, for it was not to the declared value of the exports that the House ought to look to estimate their extent, because a series of low prices would cause that value to be greatly depreciated; but, in order to estimate the extent of the exports at the different periods, the official value ought alone to be looked at, because it was not a register of the value of those exports, but simply a record of their quantities. In fact, the increase which had taken place in the importation of raw materials, proved that our trade was advancing with gigantic steps, far beyond that which had ever been carried on by any other country, and far surpassing the anticipations which the most sanguine persons formed in 1821. The amount of cotton-wool, to refer to one illustration, imported in 1826 was 177,000,000*l.*, and in 1831 it was 288,000,000*l.* If, however, he went further back, and compared the importation of this article in 1820 with that which took place in 1831, it would be found that it had been nearly, if not quite doubled. He had not the documents to refer to, but he believed, that in 1820, the quantity of cotton-wool imported was 260,000 bags, and in 1831 it was 500,000 bags. In the article of raw-silk also, an extraordinary increase of importation had taken place. This increased and increasing importation of raw material proved, in a manner impossible to controvert, that an immense increase had taken place in our manufactures. The effect of the Committee, if granted, would be, to paralyse the trade of the nation; and he was convinced that, if England were in a state of tranquillity with regard to her domestic policy, the ratio of her export trade would go on increasing, and the House would no longer hear the voice of distress from one end of the kingdom to another crying for relief, but instead of distress, the nation would reap the benefits resulting from peace and perseverance in the present policy of non-interference in foreign trade. He agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, that the alteration which was required was not in the system of free trade, but in the Corn laws; and this was an old opinion of his. He was convinced that any attempt to retrace the steps which had been taken with respect to the foreign trade of England since 1820, would not alleviate the pressure upon the commercial and trading classes in this country: the only chance for obtaining relief existed in a steady perseverance in that course of policy, and, in addition, to endeavour to afford the industry of the country as many outlets as was possible. For these reasons he was opposed to the appointment of a Committee.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* having given notice that he would submit a series of Resolutions to the House on Thursday next, would not occupy the attention of hon. Members for any length of time upon the present occasion. His object in submitting these Resolutions would be, to bring certain official documents together before the House, so as to enable hon. Members to form a correct opinion of the state of trade. This subject must force itself upon the attention of the Legislature. He, for one, was not inimical to free trade and political economy; he only objected to a gross abuse of the terms, which had caused deep distress in this country. He did not blame the Ministers, who had brought forward what they called liberal measures. The fault lay not with the Government, but arose from the state of opinion which had prevailed in that House. The new system had had a long and a fair trial, and was not the country in a most distressed state—was not every branch of trade and manufactures in a distressed condition? The system must be allowed to have produced almost univeral insolvency and bankruptcy. He had no doubt but the measure of which he complained had been adopted with the view of benefitting the country; but the result was otherwise. Unfortunately general principles were indiscriminately applied without any reference to the circumstances of each particular case, which was absolutely necessary when legislating with respect to great national interests. What might be good policy for the United States might not be so for this country. Every country must consider its own peculiar interests. If trade were thrown open entirely, the question would then be, whether it was politic for a rich nation to trade with a poor one. In his opinion, the distress in the country was not owing to the want of property, but to the unequal distribution of it. The depreciation of prices had ruined the great mass of the community, while it had enriched individuals with fixed incomes. It was a transfer from the productive, to the unproductive and opulent classes. In the last ten years, the property of persons in trade had been depreciated to the extent of fifty per cent. During that period the income of the hon. member for Middlesex had probably suffered no diminution; and consequently, he treated the distress of the trading community very lightly; "he jests at scars, who never felt a wound." It was proved by one of the witnesses examined before the Committee on the silk trade, that, out of 147 manufacturers in

Spitalfields, no less than forty-seven had been entirely ruined, or compelled to withdraw from trade, by the measure which brought foreign manufactures into competition with British manufactures in the home market. True political economy consisted in exchanging the surplus produce of one country, for the surplus produce of another. The hon. member for Middlesex was satisfied if he got goods at a reduced price. This was a good enough doctrine for those who had fixed incomes, but ruinous to the trader, who was obliged to pay the same amount of taxes, whether he got high prices or low. The workman at the present time was scarcely a consumer; the weaver, for instance, who earned 6*s*. or 7*s*. per week was a mere pauper, who could purchase nothing, not even his clothes, which were given him. It appeared from his inquiries, that in the ten years preceding 1819, the real value of British exports increased at the rate of 4,500,000*l*. per annum, whilst for the ten years succeeding that period they had decreased 6,250,000*l*. per annum. The hon. member for Middlesex said, that if we imported the produce of foreign countries those countries must take our commodities in return. This he deemed incorrect; he himself had always been a strenuous advocate for the repeal of the Corn laws, but the result of his inquiries relative to the importation of foreign corn had staggered him. The money value of foreign corn imported since 1826, amounted to 16,000,000*l*., and yet our exports had not increased a single shilling; in addition to which, this country had imported during the same period, French wine to the amount of 13,000,000*l*. This was an astounding fact! The agricultural interest ought to look to this. It was said, that the British silk manufactures were so much improved since the restrictions on the trade were removed, that large quantities of that article were exported to France. A young man who gave evidence before the Silk Committee, and who was the buyer for a large house here, stated, that he went to Paris, intending to commence business as dealer in British silk, but was unable to find purchasers. The shops in Paris contained only a few trifling articles of British manufacture, while London shops were filled with French produce. The hon. member for Middlesex was very ready to accuse others of ignorance, but indeed, as far as commercial affairs were concerned, his own mind was in utter darkness. He was fond of quoting from documents and returns, and referred to a petition which he said had been agreed to at a meeting of merchants held at the Egyptian Hall, in the City of London. He (Mr. Alderman Waithman) would undertake to say, that no such meeting had been held there—that this petition did not proceed from anything like a general meeting of the merchants of London: it was got up by a few Baltic merchants. The hon. Member was also incorrect in stating, that the hon. member for Thetford supported that petition, for that hon. Gentleman cautiously abstained from expressing an opinion with respect to many principles advanced in it. If the hon. Member had referred to the Report of the Lords' Committee, he would have found it stated there, that justice and policy forbade a departure from the restrictive system which had been so long continued in this and other countries. It was singular, that although Adam Smith himself was of opinion that the silk trade ought to be an exception to the general rule with respect to free trade, that was the first branch of manufacture which the advocates of the liberal system selected for the trial of their experiment. The hon. Member said, that low prices benefited the consumer, but the labourer, who was the great consumer, was injured by low prices, for, as he received less money in wages than he had formerly received, and continued to pay the same amount of taxes, he had, of course, less to appropriate to the supply of his own wants. The improper manner in which merchants now a-days conducted their affairs was the cause of much mischief. They ought merely to act as agents between the buyer and seller, and to receive a commission on the transaction; instead of which, merchants indulged in all kinds of speculations, and when these turned out unprofitable, they attributed their consequent ruin, not to their own ignorance and indiscretion, but to the restrictions upon commerce. The hon. Member said, no petitions had been presented against the system of free trade. This he denied. The silk manufacturers had repeatedly petitioned against the measures which produced their ruin, but their complaints had been disregarded. The right hon. member for Tamworth, and Mr. Huskisson, came down to the House and said, that the country was in a state of unexampled prosperity, because its exports were annually increasing in official value. He had shown them in vain that the exports had decreased in real value, his statements had been disregarded, and his opponents had been cheered by the House. In the mean time, the policy pursued for the last twelve years had brought the country to the brink of ruin. A large portion of the community could not pay the assessed taxes, and leases were of no value. Why should that be, if there was so much prosperity in the country? But a day of reckoning must come! He was sorry the hon. Member had brought forward his motion at this time, which was not a proper time for fully discussing the question, though he gave him credit for not wishing or intending to embarrass the Government, which every honest man must wish to support on account of the Reform Bill. When that measure should be passed, all those great national questions, which had now stood still for nearly a year and a half, must be deliberately considered. The state of the House at that moment, proved the impossibility of then entertaining these important questions. Many Members did not now consider it worth while to attend a debate on any question, be it ever so important to the country, if not connected with party, or the one all-important subject. Whatever others might say with respect to the system of free trade, in his opinion, it required only common sense to judge, from the state of the inhabitants of Spitalfields and Coventry, of the benefits free trade had conferred upon them. If he was wrong in his opinions, he was countenanced in his error by Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, and the Marquis of Lansdown, who, in the discussions relative to the commercial treaty with France, contended for the necessity of our obtaining an equivalent for the advantages which were proposed to be given to that country. They did not say, like Mr. Huskisson, and his disciples—" We will take your goods, and trust to your generosity." England had trusted to the generosity of France for six years, and as yet the latter had not purchased any of our goods. It was a curious fact, that, previous to the removal of the commercial restrictions, our exports to France were double the amount of our imports from that country; but the moment the change in the commercial system took place, our exports ceased. He would now thank the House for having listened to him, while attempting to refute doctrines which appeared to him opposed to common sense; and concluded by saying, that if the hon. Member pressed his Motion to a division, he should have his vote.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, in conformity with the recommendation of the hon. Mover, he had abstained from obtruding himself upon the attention of the House till the present moment, in order that he might hear the opinions of others, with the hope of receiving instruction from them; now he would proceed, as shortly as he could, to comment upon some of the observations which had fallen from the hon. Member. In the first place, however, he would observe, that the worthy Alderman must excuse him if he (Mr. Poulett Thomson) abstained from entering into the subject of official and real value. He was aware that the worthy Alderman entertained peculiar notions on this subject, which, year after year, he had been in the habit of communicating to the House. The subject, indeed, had been completely explained. Everything possible had been done to remove the doubts and suspicions which existed in the mind of the worthy Alderman, and, although he was still dissatisfied, the explanations which had been given were, he trusted, perfectly convincing to the mind of every other Gentleman. As far as the Motion was concerned, which the hon. Gentleman had brought forward, he could scarcely believe, that the hon. Member was in earnest. It was more natural to suppose that the hon. Member brought it forward merely in order to afford himself an opportunity of expressing his opinions. It could not really be the intention of the hon. Member to have such a Committee appointed, especially as it was not only to the terms of his Motion, but to the speech also by which he prefaced it, that the House must look as indicative of the purpose to which he would apply the Committee. From the Motion, and from the hon. Member's speech, he would have, it appeared, a Committee appointed to inquire into the East-India trade, the West-India trade, the colonial trade, the home trade, the silk and cotton manufactures, the Corn laws, the state of the currency, the state of banking, in short, into every topic connected with any interest of the country. It was not necessary for him to urge any argument beyond a mere statement of the inconvenience which would result from such a complicated inquiry, in order to induce the House to reject the proposition. If, however, this were necessary, the hon. Member had supplied arguments against himself. The hon. Member said, "I foresee that it will be urged that the appointment of a Committee will disturb the trading interests of the country by bringing a great variety of subjects unnecessarily under discussion; and, therefore, I propose to dispense with parole evidence, and to place before the Committee only the documents which are in the library of the House." But it was already the duty of every Member of the House who gave a vote on these questions, to make himself acquainted with these documents, in order that he might be able to form correct opinions. The hon. Member, in proposing a course by which inconvenience might be obviated, had completely proved the inutility of the Committee. It was useless and improper to appoint a Committee to examine documents which were, or ought to be, in the hands of every Member of that House. In the course of the very long speech which the hon. Member had made, he had jumped from one subject to another, and jumbled together all the changes which had taken place in our commercial policy and Navigation laws, and mixed up subjects which had not the slightest relation to each other, in such a manner as to render it very difficult to know where to begin to reply to him. The hon. Member had stated, as a ground for inquiry, that the shipping interest had been in a state of rapid and continual decline during the last ten years; but he must give a most unqualified denial to that assertion. Persons might differ as to the cause to which the increase in our trade and navigation was to be attributed; some might contend that our recent commercial policy had been adverse to the prosperity of the country; he should say, it had promoted that prosperity. But it was impossible for any person who looked at the documents upon the Table, to deny the fact stated by the hon. member for Bridgenorth—namely, that our trade and navigation had increased to an extent unparalleled in the history of the country. He did not wish to weary the House with details, but after the speech of the hon. Member—after the repeated promises which had been made—that he would, upon this evening, make a full exposure of the system of liberal policy pursued by the Government, he hoped the House would permit him to refer to particulars—as the hon. Member, except in about half-a-dozen isolated instances, had abstained from touching upon the leading facts of the case—to prove that our trade, as well as navigation, had increased. As the hon. Member had thought proper to arraign the commercial policy which had been sanctioned during the last twelve years by the greatest Statesmen of all parties, it might have been as well if he had confined his objections to some particular part of the system—if he had laid his finger upon a particular measure, and proved that it had operated injuriously. The hon. Member, however, said, "God forbid that I should ask for any change. I do not wish you to undo anything that you have done; I am no enemy to the system: I only think that it may be carried too far, and I wish you to enter into an inquiry before you proceed any further." The hon. Member, therefore, asked for an inquiry, in order to avoid some prospective imaginary evil which he supposed was likely to occur, and not to remedy an existing evil, arising from an error which had been committed. If that system that had been pursued during the last ten years had ever gained any triumph, it had been afforded that evening, since it appeared that the hon. Member was unable to lay his finger upon any particular measure, and say that it ought to be repealed, to make way for the system which existed before. He (Mr. Poulett Thomson) had a right to complain that the hon. Member had mixed up, in an extraordinary manner, the circumstances under which the changes in our commercial policy were made, and various Acts of Parliament which had no connexion whatever with each other. Any person who heard the hon. Member's speech, would certainly suppose that all the commercial barriers of the country, and all the Navigation laws had been entirely swept away—that every species of restriction and protection were removed. What, however, was the case? After the presentation of the petition from the merchants and traders of London, which had been alluded to, in 1820, Committees were appointed in both Houses of Parliament, composed of practical men, under whose review our Navigation laws and foreign trade were brought. This petition prayed for great changes, and the Committee, after maturely considering the whole of the subject, recommended considerable alterations. That petition was presented by the hon. member for Thetford (Mr. Baring), and supported by him in the strongest possible manner. He might be told, indeed, that his hon. friend had changed his opinions; this might be so. He did not object to any Gentleman changing his opinion upon this subject; it might injure his authority, but that it implied any censure, he (Mr. Poulett Thomson) would be the last man in the world to say. Whatever that hon. Gentleman might have done, he did not believe, that practical men had changed their opinions upon this subject. From all the intercourse he had ever had with them—and formerly it was very great—nothing would astonish him more than to find that they had altered their opinions. The recommendations, however, which they made to the Government went far beyond what the Government was able to carry into effect. The hon. Gentleman had stated, that the present Administration had gone further than either the Committee of the House of Lords, or of the House of Commons, recommended. He would distinctly deny that fact. The Report of the House of Lords recommended alterations which Ministers had never been able to make in the course of the ten years which had since elapsed. What was the proposal of his hon. friend, the member for Thetford, speaking the sentiments of those petitioners? He recommended that all goods should be admitted in all ships from all parts of the world; this would certainly have been laying the axe at the root of the Navigation laws; but had the Government ventured to do it? No such thing. The Committee recommended that goods, the produce of Asia, Africa, and America, should be allowed to enter from the ports of Europe, if in British ships, but even that was not done. The Committee of the House of Lords recommended a larger reduction of the timber duties than Ministers had been able to carry into effect. In what they had done, therefore, they had fallen far short of what was recommended to them by practical men, and by Committees of both Houses of Parliament. The worthy Alderman stated, that the London petition emanated from a few Baltic merchants; but the hon. member for Thetford would bear him out in saying, that it was signed by a large proportion of the most eminent commercial men of the metropolis. The hon. members for Thetford and Bramber themselves both signed it; but if he wanted any additional evidence upon this point, he could refer to what took place after Mr. Wallace carried into effect his first Bill. The largest deputation that ever left the city of London waited upon him in Portman-square, and thanked him for what he had done. The first alteration of the law was simply with regard to what are called enumerated articles, but the hon. Gentleman did not complain of that. But the next point, the hon. Gentleman followed up in a most extraordinary way. The system of free trade the hon. Member connected with the reciprocity treaties, although they had no more to do with each other than the most dissimilar things in the world. But was Government at liberty to make these treaties or not? Were they acts of pure concession on the part of this country, giving up advantages of which we could not be deprived? No, they were forced upon us by the acts of other powers, and most wise were the Ministers to adopt the course they did in good time: nothing but injury could have followed to our shipping had they not done so. He would not repeat the arguments in favour of those treaties which had before been so much better urged by others; but as the hon. member for Worcester spoke with so much contempt of the trade of Prussia, he would illustrate to him the general principle by what took place with regard to that very power. Prussia said to England in 1823 and 1824—"If you persist in placing our ships under a different system from your own, we shall not only retaliate by levying equal dues upon your ships, but by taxing your trade in other ways, till you are driven out of your system, or obliged to give up your commercial intercourse altogether." Which country had most to gain by a system of retaliation? Great Britain, with her 2,500,000 tons of shipping, or the country which had comparatively little? No doubt, it was a great advantage for our shipping to pay less dues than we levied upon foreigners, but we could only enjoy that advantage as long as they pleased; and when they would no longer consent to it, we were to be put upon a footing of equality. He would tell the House, with reference to the trade with France, what had been the consequence of following too closely the system advocated by the hon. member for Worcester. In 1826 a treaty of navigation was concluded with France, which, previous to that time, had allowed her Transatlantic commodities to be imported from this country. Our navigation laws would not allow anything of the kind with regard to France. When the Government made that treaty, France naturally said—"You ask for reciprocity, and we are willing to give you perfect reciprocity. Our subjects have the power of importing Transatlantic produce from you; give your subjects a similar power with regard to us." Mr. Huskisson wished to agree to this, but immediately an outcry was raised amongst the shipowners, who said—"It may be a very good arrangement for the merchants, but it will be the ruin of the shipping interest." In vain Mr. Huskisson represented to them that the whole of the carrying trade being theirs, it must be for their advantage to agree to this arrangement; they would not; and Mr. Huskisson yielded to their wishes. What had been the result? Why that, since 1826, all the produce of this description, which France wanted, and which she would find it her interest to import from this country, must first be sent to Ostend, whence it found its way to France in French shipping, and not in British. What was the case with regard to cotton-wool? Why, that it went direct from the place of its growth to France; the consequence of which was, that that carrying trade was lost to this country. What had happened to the trade with the East Indies? In 1826 there were only three Bordeaux ships engaged in the India trade, and now there were upwards of forty. He would state another, though not so constantly occurring, effect of following the system of the hon. Gentleman. Last year, owing to the disturbed state of France, the price of cotton at Havre was low, whilst at Liverpool it was high. Of course, the Liverpool merchants wished to get their cotton from Havre instead of going to the United States for it; and, under any proper state of trade, they would have done so; but what actually took place? The cotton was shipped from Havre to the Bermudas, and afterwards brought thence to Liverpool by the merchants; but, as the expense of that circuitous conveyance was very great, very few cargoes of cotton were thus brought to this country, and the carrying trade of that cotton from Havre to Liverpool was lost to our ships, whilst our merchants were deprived of the advantage of getting their goods in the cheapest market. He mentioned this for the purpose of showing that restrictions might prove most prejudicial to interests they were intended to protect. From the manner in which the honourable Gentleman attacked reciprocity treaties, one might be led to imagine that they were something unheard of before 1824. But, from 1787 to 1815, we were constantly quarrelling with the United States of America, for want of an understanding of this kind. What happened? After disturbing trade, and, what was worse, but, as always happened in such cases, after producing ill-blood on both sides, leading to warfare, we were glad, in 1815, to yield that for which we had been contending so long, and agree to a system of reciprocity. The same thing happened with regard to the Brazils. In fact, we kept the advantage as long as it was not disputed. It was absurd to suppose that other nations would permit England to take an unfair advantage of them; and not only was it the most plain, straightforward course, but most for our interest, at once to offer them equal terms. He would now state to the House, very shortly, what had, in figures, been the condition of the shipping of this country during the last ten years. He would not follow the hon. Gentleman in his account of our trade, but he would do that which would tell as much as possible in favour of the honourable Gentleman's argument, namely, take the account of our shipping trading to those countries, with which we had made the so-much-decried treaties of reciprocity. The shipping entered inwards was the criterion hitherto taken, and he would state the average of that for the three years, 1819, 1820, and 1821—before the alteration of our system took place; and afterwards the average of the three years, 1829, 1830, and 1831, when the treaties of reciprocity with the countries he had alluded to had been some time in operation. The average of the first period stood thus:—

	Tons.
British shipping entered inwards	1,692,000
Foreign shipping entered inwards	462,000

Whilst, in the second period, the average account stood thus.—

	Tons.
British shipping entered inwards	2,243,000
Foreign shipping entered inwards	781,000

Thus showing an increase in the tonnage of British shipping amounting to 551,000 tons; whilst the increase in the amount of foreign shipping was only 319,000 tons. The hon. Gentleman, however, said that this amount was not a fair one; that he preferred one of the shipping registered and built, as his guide. He should have it; but he must say, that he considered this account perfectly fair. Nothing was, indeed, more unfair than what the hon. Member had said with respect to short voyages. The hon. Gentleman should recollect, that voyages were formerly long on account of ships being detained for a length of time with convoys, and that they had now been shortened by the return of peace, and by the improvements that had taken place in nautical science. He remembered the time when it was a rare occurrence for ships to make more than two voyages to St. Petersburgh; but now they all made at least three voyages; and there were many instances of ships making four voyages in the year. The fact was, that since profits had been reduced, exertions had been made to save as much time as possible, economy of time being economy of money. But, unfair as the hon. Gentleman's statement was, he would take it and show him that even that proved him to be wrong. This he would do by taking the amount of shipping built and registered in the periods he had already named, the very return on which the hon. Gentleman had so much relied. The number of ships built and registered in the British empire was, in the year 1819, 112,000 tons; in 1820, 84,000 tons; and in 1821, 74,000 tons, being an average of 88,000 tons. In 1829, the amount of shipping built and registered was 116,000 tons; in 1830, 110,000 tons; and in 1831, 107,000 tons, in the last year, not including the ships built in the colonies, making an average of 111,000 tons. Did that show any decrease of shipping built and registered? Did it not rather show a great increase, in spite of the frequent voyages the hon. Gentleman alluded to? He would further state to the House the gross amount of tonnage registered in the United Kingdom, and that reminded him of a curious mistake into which the hon. Gentleman had fallen, and against which he should have thought the hon. Gentleman would have been guarded, by the fact of another hon. Gentleman having fallen into it four years ago, and been corrected. It only showed the kind of attention the hon. Gentleman must have paid to the subject. He would explain the hon. Gentleman's error presently; but first he would proceed to state the amount of shipping registered. In 1819, it amounted to 2,660,000 tons; in 1820, to 2,640,000; in 1821, to 2,560,000; it amounted, in 1831, to 2,581,000 tons, showing a slight diminution as compared with 1819 and 1820. "But, then," said the hon. Gentleman, and this was the error the hon. Gentleman had committed, "there was a great falling off in 1826 and the years imdiately following." Now, to all these printed returns, there was a note appended, stating, that in consequence of an alteration of the system of registering, the returns for the year 1826 appeared smaller, and that that alteration consisted in striking out of the registry a number of old ships which still remained in it, although no longer in existence as ships. To say, therefore, that there had been a diminution in the registered tonnage since 1826, was a fallacy arising from a want of attention to the circumstances under which the accounts had been presented to the House. It appeared, then, from what he had stated, that the number of voyages had increased while the amount of shipping registered, was the same as, or more than, it used to be. In an account of the British shipping entered into the United Kingdom from the Brazils, France, Germany, Sweden, and the other States with which we had these treaties; it was proved that the average of British shipping so entering during the years 1819, 1820, and 1821, was 463,000 tons, and during the years 1829, 1830, and 1831, 629,000 tons; which made an increase of 35 per cent on British shipping employed in trade with countries with which we had reciprocity treaties;—those treaties which were said to have proved the ruin and destruction of British commerce. Could there be stronger or more convincing evidence to refute the hon. Gentleman's assertions? Yes: he would state to the House the enormous amount of tonnage employed in our fisheries, and the colonial and coasting trade, and would completely prove that there was no occasion for the fears of the hon. Gentleman, that our navigation would die away, and we should have reason to rue the day when we departed first from the old system. The amount of tonnage in the coasting trade, according to the shipping entering and departing was 9,800,000. It was natural that every Englishman should wish his country to remain the greatest naval power in the world, but any alarm upon that subject, while such evidence could be adduced was, he must confess, preposterous and unworthy of any well-informed man's understanding. The hon. member for Middlesex had truly said, that it might be supposed from the hon. Gentleman's speech, that Government had by its measures destroyed all the barriers of the trade of this country, and allowed a complete influx of foreign goods of every description. Unfortunately, Government had as yet been able to do but very little towards freeing the trade of this country from the restrictions under which it had hitherto laboured. A few laws had been repealed, the Custom House regulations and fiscal arrangements had been made more distinct, but with regard to allowing foreign goods to come into England, little or nothing had been done. Goods in which no competition could be feared had been admitted at moderate duties. The only manufactured articles of any importance which had been admitted more freely than before, were silks and gloves. Duties had been taken off raw materials, but not off manufactured goods. The hon. Member, in his sweeping assertions against the late and the present Government, had said, "You have admitted the wines of France at the same duties as the wines of Portugal." This trifling question had been urged again and again last year, when the hon. Gentleman had had an opportunity of delivering his opinion on the subject; he would not, therefore, follow the hon. Gentleman now through his details, but make only one observation. The hon. Gentleman had said, "You have favoured France, and she will do nothing for us." Ministers had only done what was just, in admitting the produce of one country at a duty as low as that imposed on the produce of another country, and France had had no inducement to do anything for us till we removed the restrictions upon her wines. In his opinion, the hon. Gentleman who had given the House his recommendations for the advancement of the interest of our commerce with other States, would soon find that that recommendation was not wanted to induce the Government to urge other countries, where that could be done with advantage, to alter their commercial systems. The hon. Gentleman had stated, that he had commercial relations with foreign States, which would be ready, if they could obtain equal concessions from this country to liberalize, their commercial codes. If such were the case, it would have been wise for the hon. Gentleman to apply to his hon. friend, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, or to the Board of Trade, to ascertain if Ministers were inclined to act upon the hon. Gentleman's information. He was not aware of any such application having been made. He assured the hon. Gentleman that, although Ministers did not approve of binding two countries by commercial treaties for any number of years, in a manner inconvenient to both, yet he did injustice to the Government, and was mistaken, if he supposed that Ministers were wanting in their endeavour to promote liberality, by offering to meet any improvements by corresponding alterations. He trusted France would ere long see the wisdom of removing restrictions, and taking away protections which could only end in the impoverishing of her subjects, and in raising for her a structure of false and flimsy manufactures which could not support themselves, because they were not based on that which alone could permanently support manufactures, the intrinsic powers of the country itself. The policy of Government had been, to point out to other countries the advantages of a more liberal system, to demonstrate to them the benefits that must result from reciprocal concessions, and to assure them that the system recommended by the British Government must eventually prevail and become general. The hon. Gentleman had made it a matter of reproach to Ministers, that they had not stipulated for any advantages before they made their concessions; but why should they, by doing so, inflict a penalty upon themselves for a longer period than was necessary? It was preposterous to talk now of our conferring a benefit on other countries by taking their productions whilst they would not take ours. He had before asked the hon. Gentleman, whether he believed that France would give to this country any of her goods without receiving an adequate return? at which the hon. Gentleman had taken umbrage. It was, nevertheless, true, that we neither did, nor could, obtain any goods from France without giving something in return. The worthy Alderman had attempted to prove, by some magical figures, that France had, during the last few years, bestowed on us 15,000,000*l.* worth of goods. That would, indeed, be a splendid gift; but, unfortunately, the statement could not be true. The description of the condition of our commerce for the last ten years, which the hon. Gentleman had made, was greatly exaggerated, and, by a reference to the returns of the exports and imports, he would at once show the error that had been committed. In 1819, 1820, and 1821, the average official value of the goods imported was, in round numbers, 31,000,000*l.* In 1829, 1830, and 1831, the average official value of the imports was 47,000,000*l.* Thus it appeared that the imports in the course of ten years increased from 31,000,000*l.* to 47,000,000*l.*, under the present ruinous system, according to the hon. Gentleman. The official value of the exports during the same period, increased from 47,000,000*l.*—which was the average value for the three first years—to 67,000,000*l.*; for the years 1829 and 1830, and during last year, the official value of the exports was no less than 71,000,000*l.* This, then, was another proof of the ruinous nature of the more liberal system of commercial policy adopted by this country! There was one other paper with which he should trouble the House, which related to the foreign trade of the country. He had heard it urged by hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the House ought not to take the general amount of the goods imported or exported, as, in consequence of the increased trade with our colonies, and especially India, they were not a correct criterion of the increase or decline of foreign trade. He held in his hand an official return of the goods exported to foreign countries for several years. It appeared by that, that the average return of British and Irish produce exported to foreign countries in 1819, 1820, and 1821, was 26,000,000*l.*, taking the official value. In 1829, and 1830, the average official return, was 41,000,000*l.*, and last year it amounted to 45,650,000*l.* That was well worthy of the attention of the House, for it had often been said, that the gross return told nothing as regarded the value of the foreign trade of the country. He thought he had now shown, that the anticipations, or rather the assertions of the hon. Member, that the trade of this country was decreasing, and upon which he had founded his Motion, were entirely erroneous, and that he had made out no case which could justify the House in agreeing to his proposition; but he might be told, as he had been, that there was no use in carrying on a system of trade under which our capital was diminished, our manufacturers ruined, our merchants bankrupts, our traders destroyed, and our industrious labouring classes compelled to seek shelter in the workhouses. He denied the facts altogether: it was true, that there did exist—as there always would exist—in a great country like England, where there were so many branches of manufacture—where there was such an artificial state of society—and where the amount of taxation was, necessarily, so great—some local distress, and some description of manufacture in a state of depression. He was aware that one important branch of productive industry, in particular, had to contend against some difficulties, and this must, when there were so many branches of manufacture, often be the case with one; but when he was told, that the labouring classes and the manufacturers were worse off than they were ten years ago, he would reply—bold as the contradiction might be—that he did not credit this. The hon. Gentleman said, that it was useless to quote official papers, for he had information which convinced him of this, and left no doubt on his mind. The hon. Gentleman observed also, that it was not fair to say that trade was good because it had apparently increased, as the merchants had been carrying it on at a loss, or at any rate, at a very small profit. Now, this might be the case for a year or two; but to tell him that men would persist for ten years in carrying on business which they found unprofitable, was to utter a gross fallacy, and to argue against every principle of human nature; and, therefore, he did not believe that the assertion was founded in fact. With reference to those details which had been alluded to—which he must call miserable statistics—for miserable they unquestionably were—he did not believe the statement, that the situation of the labouring classes was worse than it was; on the contrary, he believed that the condition of the lower classes had improved within the last ten years. He knew that it was unpopular to express this opinion, but he would never be deterred by any fear of unpopularity from expressing his honest and deliberate opinion, and of giving utterance to the truth, because it might be unpalatable. He believed that real wages were higher than they had been; that the labourer could, for an equal quantity of labour, command more of the comforts and conveniences of life than he could ten years ago. He would admit, that there had been a considerable fall in many wages since the period of the peace, but he believed that the price of commodities had fallen much more than the price of labour. He would appeal to returns as a proof of this statement, which he knew were liable to objections; but in the mode in which he should refer to them, the objections, if they told at all, would tell against himself. He alluded to the returns relative to the poor-rates. He would not take the general poor-rates, but the whole of the money paid for relief: this was certainly not a decisive criterion, but it was in favour of his opponents. According to the Parliamentary Returns, the sum actually paid for the relief of the poor in 1818, 1819, and 1820, taking the average of the three years, was 7,500,000*l.* In 1831, the sum paid for the same purpose was 6,798,000*l.*; thus there had been a diminution in the poor-rates to the amount of 700,000*l.*, although the population had increased upwards of 2,000,000 in the last ten years. This was a sufficient presumption, that the condition of the labouring classes of this country was not worse than it had been. Thus, then, the statement, that our manufactures had gone to ruin, our capital been diminished, and that the condition of our labouring population was deteriorated, since the introduction of a more liberal system of commercial policy, was equally unfounded and mischievous. He hoped he had now satisfactorily disposed of so much of the hon. Gentleman's argument as went to show, that the condition of the country was much worse now than ten years ago. When the hon. Gentleman argued, that the system of free trade had produced mischief in this country, he must tell the hon. Gentleman, that that system had had no connexion with the labour and capital of this country, and, in fact, no such system existed. There was another consideration well worthy of attention. In alluding to this subject, it should not be forgotten, that this country competed with the producers of all other countries in the foreign market, and that the price at which the foreign manufacturer could produce his commodity, regulated our prices, and, consequently, our profits. Of course, competition would equalize prices as well as profits and wages, and, as long as we had foreign trade, we should have thus to contend with other countries which supplied the foreign markets; but, independently of this competition, there was another to which this country was exposed, and which was invariably left out of consideration. Our manufacturer had not only to compete with the foreign produce, but also with the competition in the home market, which also must have the same effect of lowering profits and wages. If examples of this were wanting in the productions of our own country, he might refer to one of our great branches of manufacture, where there was no foreign competition, but where the prices had been reduced entirely by home competition. This was the last statement on this part of the subject with which he should trouble the House; he, therefore, trusted, that he should be favoured with its attention for a few minutes. He alluded to the iron trade. Even the opponents of the system adopted for the last ten years would admit, that it had not had the slightest effect on that trade. There had been no competition from abroad, none but among the home producers themselves. Now, what were the facts? In 1824, the price of iron was 11*l.* or 12*l.* per ton, and now the price was from 4*l.* 10*s.* to 5*l.*, and the question was, what had led to this reduction in the price of iron? If we had only imported some 7,000, 8,000 or 10,000 tons, it would have been said, that foreign competition had occasioned it. But what was the fact? Every one acquainted with the subject must admit, that the great reduction in price had been occasioned by the competition existing among the home producers, He believed, that, in this trade, for some months, the capitalists had been actually continuing their work without profit, and sometimes even with loss, rather than abandon the labourers to the state of destitution to which they would be exposed, if the iron manufacturers ceased, even for a time, to work. He had, in his hand, a return from the three great iron districts, showing the present state of that trade in comparison with its former condition. This paper had been prepared by a gentleman well acquainted with the subject, who visited these places in the years 1825 and 1831, and showed the number of furnaces as well as the quantity produced. According to this statement (and he believed his friend, the hon. member for the city of London, admitted its accuracy), in South Wales, in the year 1822—this was the year before the rise in the price of iron, and the inducement to speculate—in South Wales there were seventy-three blast furnaces; the quantity of iron produced was 182,000 tons. In Staffordshire, in 1823, there were eighty-four blast furnaces, and the quantity produced was 133,000 tons. In Shropshire, in the same year, there were thirty-eight blast furnaces, and the quantity of iron produced was 57,000 tons. He had returns from a number of other districts, but it was unnecessary for him to go into them, as he had mentioned the chief iron districts. In 1830, in South Wales, there were 113 blast furnaces, and the produce was 277,000 tons. In Staffordshire, there were 123 furnaces, and the produce was 212,000 tons. In Shropshire, the number of furnaces was forty-eight, and the quantity of iron produced was 73,000 tons. Thus it appeared that, in 1823, the quantity of iron produced in these districts was 373,000 tons, whereas, in 1830, it amounted to 563,000 tons. The diminution in price on this article could thus be satisfactorily accounted for by a reference to internal competition, and, such being the case, it was idle to talk of foreign competition. The truth was, that the prices would continue low until the quantity sent to market bore a strict relation to the demand. The papers to which he had referred were all on the Table of the House. Without further discussing our trade with France, he would merely state, that the hon. Member was mistaken with respect to the treaty with that country; that treaty having been rightly interpreted, and the objections of the hon. Member entirely hypothetical. The hon. Gentleman had stated his conviction, that the American tariff would not be altered. The hon. member for Middlesex had referred the hon. Gentleman to a document which it was astonishing the hon. Gentleman had not seen before. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, there were strong complaints against the evils produced by this tariff. There had been a sort of negotiation between the conflicting parties, which had ended in an understanding, that the tariff was to be greatly modified. The hon. Gentleman said, the Americans had followed the wiser plan of protection and restriction; he would answer him in the words of an American writer, who had been Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Cambreling said, "while under this wise administration of the national affairs of our maritime rival, her national industry, her commerce with the world, and her wealth and power, have been increasing with accelerated velocity, we have, by introducing an opposite policy, wasted our resources, and most effectually arrested the progress of a country which nature and Providence had designed to be the first among nations. To go on with such measures is impossible, without ruining our industry and disgracing our union. Whilst our once flourishing navigation has been falling in the rear of the maritime world, we have been speculating amidst the refinements of an antiquated philosophy," Such were the views of Mr. Cambreling who was Secretary of the American Treasury, and intimately acquainted with the working of the system. This was the comparison drawn by a statesman between the commercial policy of his own country and that of this nation. It was true, a strong party feeling existed in America, but, in this report, the statements were all founded on undisputed facts with which there was no possibility of contending. The hon. Member had also referred to the amount of shipping in the United States, and had asserted, that it had increased under the restrictive system. In reply to this, he would refer the hon. Gentleman to the Report of Congress, taken from the official documents, relative to the shipping of the United States. He had ascertained from these papers, that the registered tonnage of the United States, in 1815, was 1,331,000 tons. In 1830 it amounted to 1,260,000; thus, in fifteen years, there was a falling off to the amount of 100,000 tons. The official documents, therefore, confirmed, even up to the latest period, the opinions of Mr. Cambreling, and confuted the allegations of the hon. Gentleman. So much, therefore, for the assertion, that American commerce had greatly advanced under a restrictive system, which the appeal to the official returns showed to be incorrect. Much had been said of the injury inflicted on our colonies by the present system. This part of the subject had been amply discussed when the Colonial Intercourse Bill was before the House, which had been left as a legacy to the present Government by their predecessors in office. He would, therefore, not refer further to the subject, which the hon. Member might, if he wished it, bring before the House by a separate and distinct motion. One statement he would, however, make, which would clearly prove the increase of the home trade. There were imported, in the year 1819, 97,000,600 lbs. of cotton wool; in 1831, no less than 280,000,000 lbs., being an increase of 187 for every hundred: of sheep's wool, in 1819, 15,000,000 lbs.; in 1831, 30,000,000 lbs.: of flax, in 1819, 400,000 cwts.; in 1831, 900,000 cwts.: of silk, in 1819, 1,800,000 lbs., and in 1831, 4,300,000 lbs.: of tallow, in 1819, 600,000 cwts.; and in 1831, 900,000 cwts.: of sugar retained for actual consumption, in 1819, 2,800,000 cwts.; in 1831, 3,800,000 cwts.: of coffee, entered for home consumption, in 1819, 7,800,000 lbs.; in 1831, no less than 22,700,000 lbs.: of tea, in 1819, 26,000,000 lbs.; in 1831, 30,000,000 lbs.: of tobacco, in 1819, 16,500,000 lbs; in 1831, 19,600,000 lbs. Thus it appeared that the increase in the importation of cotton wool in that period amounted to 187 per cent; in sheep's wool to 92 per cent; in flax to 130 per cent; in silk to 125 per cent; in tallow to 53 per cent; in sugar to 34 per cent; in coffee to 191 per cent; in tea to 15 per cent; and in tobacco to 18 per cent. Thus it appeared, too, that, in articles used in our manufactures, the lowest increase had been 55 per cent; the highest nearly 200 per cent. In articles of pure consumption the increase varied from 15 to 191 per cent, the increase of the lowest being 15, and the highest 191. Allowing, then, for the increase of the population of 16 per cent, and looking to every kind of commodity the increased consumption had been far greater than the increase of population. It was, therefore, erroneous to assert, whoever might say so, that the condition of the people of this country had deteriorated. He regretted the manner in which the Motion had been made, it would have been only fair, candid, and manly on the part of those who objected to the system which had been pursued for the last ten years, instead of bringing forward motions of inquiry, and indulging in vague declamations on these subjects, boldly to come forward and state their views, and to point out in which respect they differed from the policy of the Government. This would have been better than in attacking their opponents to indulge in general accusations without stating distinctly of what they complained. In seasons of difficulty it was easy to excite a popular prejudice by stating that free trade was the cause of any local or occasional distress which might exist. This might do as well as any other nick-name to save people the trouble of thinking for themselves; but was it worthy of hon. Gentlemen to act thus? He did not charge the hon. Member with wilfully deluding the people, but this was the inevitable result of his mode of proceeding. He called upon the hon. Member to bring forward a direct motion, and not to tell the ignorant and uneducated that the sufferings which they endured arose from things which had no existence. That man was the greatest enemy to the people who could lend himself to deceptions of this nature. To express his opinions thus boldly might subject him, he was aware, to a great deal of obloquy, but he should pay but little attention to it, and it never should prevent him from stating his opinions or from pursuing a course which he conceived to be beneficial to his country. The hon. Member had told the House that the responsibility of rejecting this measure would fall personally upon him (Mr. Poulett Thomson). That it would not, for it rested with the Government. He should, however, be sorry to act with any Government which entertained different views from those he entertained on the subject, and if it were possible for him to incur the responsibility of rejecting this Motion, he should not shrink from it—nay, he would gladly embrace it. If the hon. Gentleman would bring forward any motion, he should be prepared to argue the question fairly, leaving it to the country to decide between them.

Mr. *Baring* perfectly concurred with his right hon. friend, that the distress of the country was very greatly exaggerated; though he, of course, did not deny that there was some distress—but then, what rich and powerful country was there in the world in which distress did not exist? It was the necessary consequence of complicated interests and extensive transactions. He remembered, by the bye, having made a similar statement on a previous evening, when he was turned round upon by the hon. member for Middlesex, and told, that until he was starving, himself, he could not judge of the distress of the people. He was glad, however, that we were not that degraded and distressed people which a bad Government, like that which was now passing away, might be supposed to have left us—happy that those who were to begin the new æra would find the country better off than could reasonably be expected. Upon the whole, he must say, that he was satisfied by the statements of his right hon. friend (Mr. Poulett Thomson), except when he dealt in political economy. In general he agreed with what his right hon. friend had stated; but he did not admire what his right hon. friend probably thought the most philosophical part of his argument. He was not himself in love with free trade; and thought it was better to employ those who employed us, than buy of those who would buy nothing of us in return. With respect to the Motion now before the House, he certainly must say, that, in his opinion, though the hon. member for Worcester had made a most able statement, he doubted whether a sufficient case had been made out by that hon. Gentleman for the appointment of a Committee. He felt disposed, indeed, to refuse his assent to the Motion, thinking that the ground assigned for inquiry was not sufficient. Under all the circumstances, he disapproved of the loss of time and labour that must result from the appointment of a Committee.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that he would not have taken any share in the present discussion, had it not been for the observations which had fallen from the hon. member for Thetford on the subject of free trade. The principles of free trade he always had been, and always should be, ready to vindicate; and he was surprised that a merchant of such extensive dealings as the hon. Member should be so blind as he was to the beneficial application of them in this country. He was averse to the appointment of a Committee.

An *Hon. Member* stated, that he carried on business to a large extent, and employed some thousand persons; he was, therefore, in a situation to form an opinion, and he insisted that the country was in a state of unexampled distress. He denied, however, that the distress had arisen from free trade. He wished there was much more free trade; and thought the distress was solely attributable to the alteration of the currency, and that it would continue until we returned to the ancient state of things, as regarded our monetary system.

Mr. *Attwood* would not have risen upon this occasion, had he not been aware of the weight attached to every observation which fell from his hon. friend, the member for Thetford. His hon. friend had stated, that the accounts of the distress of the country were greatly exaggerated—he was afraid that they were not. The great increase of pauperism and of crime within the last few years, sufficiently indicated the pressure of distress. Indeed, he believed that every interest of the country, commercial, agricultural, and manufacturing, was at this moment in a state of great embarrassment. People were afraid of looking at the real cause of it. He had repeatedly stated what that cause was, in his opinion, and it was, therefore, unnecessary for him to say a word more regarding it on the present occasion.

Colonel *Torrens* said, that as his views on this subject coincided with those of the hon. member for Thetford, he could not agree to the appointment of the Committee for which the hon. member for Worcester moved.

Mr. *Robinson* denied, that he had brought forward the Motion with any unkind or unfair feeling towards his Majesty's Government, as had been laid to his charge, but merely with a view, by offering his own opinions, to call the attention of the House to a most important subject. After what had fallen from several hon. Members, he should yield to their suggestion, and not press his Motion to a division.

Motion negatived.

CHARTER OF THE BANK OF ENGLAND.] Lord *Althorp* said, that the Motion on this subject, of which he had given notice, was one of the greatest importance, as it affected the prosperity of the country in the greatest degree, and nothing would have induced him to have brought it forward at so late an hour, but that, as it was for a Committee of Inquiry, he did not think it was right to delay it. He was anxious it should not have been delayed, but other circumstances had prevented him from bringing it forward as early as he could have wished. There was another ground on which he conceived it would appear that it was not improper for him now to bring it forward, which was, that he did not intend to enter into any discussion, or state his own views on the subject; indeed, it would be almost using contradictory terms for him to say, he would move for a Committee of Secresy, and yet, at the same time, explain the views to the House which would guide him in Committee. It would be inconvenient, nay, improper, even if he had had an opportunity of addressing the House at an earlier period of the night, for him to have gone into a statement of his views on the banking system. He would state the reasons on which he grounded his proposal for a Committee. This was the first instance when the Bank Charter was proposed to be referred to a Committee of this House. But a feeling had existed for a number of years past, that the period of the renewal of the Bank Charter was the proper time for an inquiry into the general system of banking. Great anxiety had been expressed that this opportunity should be taken; and the principles on which the Bank had conducted its business should be subjected to the review of the Legislature. And he did not think he should have acted consistently with his duty, if he had entered into any negotiations with the Bank, relative to the renewal of the Charter, without first appealing to the House, and bringing the whole case fairly before a Committee. It was desirable that this Committee should be one of secresy; for although he knew secresy was not very particularly observed on these occasions, yet the advantage was, that the question could not be brought into discussion in the House, or what took place in the Committee be there adverted to. This was a great advantage; for when so many interests were concerned, that discussion should arise before the matter was completely concluded in the Committee would be attended with great injury. He hoped that the House would not object to appoint a Committee of Secresy. The first questions it would have to discuss would be, whether the Charter was to be renewed, and exclusive privileges of any description given to the Bank of England? And if these questions were decided in the affirmative, the Committee would then have to recommend on what conditions, and under what restrictions, these privileges should be conceded. He thought it would be desirable, also, that the general condition of the banks of issue in the country should be taken into consideration. The issuing of money was the prerogative of the State, and, therefore, the Legislature had a right to say, on what conditions individuals should be allowed to issue money. There was another point of view under which the Bank of England must be looked at, viz.—as the banker of the State. The bargains made with it in this capacity, and as the manager of the Public Debt, should be inquired into. The Bank of England was both a bank of issue and the banker of the State, and it was incumbent that those two characters should be kept distinct in the inquiries of the Committee. He should go into the Committee having his own opinions, but he hoped he had candour enough to give them up if they were wrong. The currency was connected with the question of the Bank Charter; but to enter into that in the Committee, would involve the Committee in contradictions, and he thought it ought not to be touched. He thought, certainly, that the Committee ought not to go into any consideration of the standard of value. He had his own opinion, too, concerning the issue of 1*l.* notes, but though he did not wish that subject to be debated, it was impossible to exclude it from the Committee. He had great difficulty in selecting the Committee, but he believed he had placed on it a representative of every interest and every opinion. He had made the Committee numerous; it would consist of thirty persons, besides himself, which was as great a number as could be placed on a Committee of Secresy. At the same time, he felt that he had omitted several Gentlemen who would well deserve to be placed on it. The noble Lord concluded by moving for the appointment of "a Committee of Secresy to inquire into, and report upon the expediency of renewing the Charter to the Bank of England, and also on the existing system of banking by Banks of Issue in England and Wales."

Mr. *Baring* said, that if there should be that variety of opinion amongst the several members of the Committee, which the noble Lord seemed to think, there might be a difficulty in their coming to one general conclusion as to their report, and it was of the utmost importance that they should come to a sound opinion, as the system of banking in this country for the next twenty or twenty-five years might depend upon their decision. There were two points on which he did not clearly understand the noble Lord, and was, therefore, anxious for some further information respecting them. The question of the 1*l.* note circulation was totally different from that of the renewal of the Bank Charter, and he did not see why they should be mixed up. Did he understand the noble Lord that they were both to form subjects of consideration in the Committee? The other point on which he did not clearly comprehend the noble Lord was, as to the terms on which the Bank was to transact the public business, or be made the banker of the State, and as to the compensation which the public might expect to obtain for giving to that body exclusively the management of the Public Debt, and the privilege of issuing notes in the metropolis. He should rather think, that whatever bargain was to be made with the Bank in this respect, should be on the responsibility of Government, and not left to the arrangement of a Committee. The Government, of course, would make the best bargain it could for the public, and the Bank would be able to take care of its own interests. Would it not be well that some instructions should be given to the Committee on these points?

Lord *Althorp* said, that as to the subject of the 1*l.* notes, he had formed his own opinion; but at the same time he felt it impossible to exclude it from the consideration of the Committee, if they should think fit to enter upon it. As to the other point, he thought the Committee was not the fit medium through which a bargain should be made with the Bank. They might give their opinion as to the terms of the present bargain, but the Government should be left to make any future arrangement that it might deem necessary on that subject. These, however, were matters which could not be excluded from the consideration of the Committee, if the Members pleased to enter upon them, unless the House tied up their hands more strictly than ought to be the case with such a Committee.

Mr. *Hume* said, from what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baring), as to the decision of this Committee having an influence upon the system of banking in this country for the next twenty years, that hon. Member seemed to think that the Committee were only to consider the renewal of the Charter; which the hon. Member took for granted would be renewed, but as it appeared to him (Mr. Hume), the Committee might consider and report upon the expediency of renewing the Bank Charter at all.

Mr. *Pearse* had heard the noble Lord's statement as to the different opinions on the subject of banking, which the several members of the Committee were supposed to represent. He hoped that the noble Lord would select a sufficient number of practical men to go through the details of the Committee, and that they should not find on it a set of philosophers; for he always found that where such men applied themselves to practical measures, they were very obstinate, and it was difficult to move them from their preconceived opinions. An unsatisfactory decision by the Committee, on this important subject, would only lead to future remonstrances, and to great annoyance and inconvenience.

Sir *Henry Parnell* understood that the Committee were to take into consideration not merely the renewal of the Charter, but the whole subject of banking. As to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. Pearse), that there should be practical men on the Committee, he would beg to ask that hon. Member, how the practical men had managed the Bank of England after the suspension of cash payments in 1797? The hon. Member was then a Director, and must remember that the effect of that measure was a depreciation of Bank paper to the amount of thirty per cent. That depreciation was, however, denied by the practical men of that day, and on that denial was founded a memorable vote of that House.

Sir *Richard Vyvyan* thought it not a little extraordinary, that now, at what he might call the close of this self-doomed and self-admitted corrupt Parliament, the noble Lord should have appointed such a Committee as this. How did they know how long this Parliament might last, or whether they should ever be returned again? He remembered that, eighteen months ago, an hon. friend of his asked the noble Lord, whether he intended to bring forward any measure relative to the currency of the country, and the noble Lord stated he had no such intention. Now, however, when a measure had passed that House, which hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial side said, that the whole country demanded, and which was to be carried through the other House by any and every means—at such a time, when they were not certain of having this Parliament another Session, they were about to enter into the whole question of the currency. He did not say that they were to go into the question of the standard of value, but they were to go into the question of the issue of 1*l.* notes. He must protest against that course. He thought they ought to wait until the Bill which, as he had said, was to be carried through the other House by any means, should have passed.

Mr. *Courtenay* could not concur with his hon. friend, that they ought to defer this subject to a new Parliament, for that, he thought, instead of being for the better would be for the worse.

Lord *Althorp* said, the hon. Baronet did not seem to understand the question before the House, or to have an accurate recollection of the subject to which he had referred. The question which had been asked of him, soon after he came into office, was, whether he had any intention of altering the standard of value; to which he stated, that he had not; but in the last Parliament he did state, that it was his intention to bring forward this question of the renewal of the Bank Charter at an early period. The hon. Baronet, therefore, was not justified in charging him with any inconsistency on that subject. It should also be recollected, that the Charter would expire next year, and that there was no time to be lost in considering the question of its renewal, if it were to be renewed. As to the labours of the Committee being extended to another Session, he must say that he did not think that it would take a long time. It was a matter more of opinion than of evidence; and as the Committee would consist of practical men, their opinions would be drawn out without any great examination of oral evidence, though, of course, some evidence would be brought before them. He repeated, that the answer which he gave the hon. member for Aldborough, on the occasion to which the hon. Baronet alluded, related to the standard of value.

Sir *Richard Vyvyan* had understood the noble Lord in the way he had mentioned, but he was still surprised that the question should be brought forward at such a time as the present. Suppose it was not now decided, would it not be agitated again in a new Parliament? Would it not be better, therefore, to introduce some temporary measure at present, and leave the whole question open for consideration in the next Parliament.

Mr. *Wolryche Whitmore* was understood to ask the noble Lord, whether it would not be better to exclude the consideration of the 1*l.* note issue from the Committee?

Lord *Althorp* had already stated, that he did not think it possible to exclude that subject. His own opinion was, that it would be better not to bring it under discussion; but if the Committee should choose to enter upon it, he did not see how he could shape his Motion so as to prevent them.

Mr. *Baring:* Would it not be better, then, to exclude it altogether from the Committee, or have a distinct Committee appointed for its consideration, for it was quite a different question from that of a renewal of the Bank Charter? Did he understand the noble Lord, that it was not imperative on the Committee to enter upon the subject, but that they were competent to do so if they thought proper?

Lord *Althorp:* That was his opinion; and if his opinion alone were to decide, he would rather that it should not be gone into by the Committee.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* thought it would be better to restrict the Committee from entering upon that subject; the more particularly as the 1*l.* notes did not form part of the present circulation of the country, and the entering upon it at the present time would be again to agitate the subject, and to raise expectations which might not be realized.

Mr. *Hume* hoped the noble Lord would not restrict the Committee in that respect. The circulation of Scotland and Ireland consisted, in great part, of 1*l.* notes, but it was different in England, and he did not see why the Committee should be prevented from carrying their inquiries into that subject.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, his answer to the remark of the hon. member for Middlesex was simply this—that the inquiries of the Committee were confined to England and Wales.

Mr. *Attwood* thought they must enter into the question of 1*l.* notes, and to the issues of country banks; and when they had considered these subjects, it would be for the Committee to decide on the matters that might arise out of those inquiries.

Mr. *Gisborne* also thought the subject of the 1*l.* notes could not be excluded from the consideration of the Committee. The whole subject ought to be left open to the Committee.

Mr. *Robinson* concurred with the noble Lord in thinking that it would be impossible to exclude those subjects from the consideration of the Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Committee appointed as follows. Lord Althorp, Sir R. Peel, Lord J. Russell, Mr. Goulburn, Sir J. Graham, Mr. Herries, Mr. Poulett Thomson, Mr. Courtenay, Colonel Maberly, Sir Henry Parnell, Mr. Vernon Smith, Mr. John Smith, Mr. Robarts, Sir M. W. Ridley, Mr. Attwood, Sir John Newport, Mr. A. Baring, Mr. Irving, Mr. Warburton, Mr. G. Phillips, Lord Morpeth, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Heywood, Lord Ebrington, Sir J. Wrottesley, Mr. Lawley, Mr. Cavendish, Mr. Alderman Wood, Mr. B. Carter, Mr. Strutt, Mr. Stanley.

Sir *Richard Vyvyan* asked why the noble Lord had omitted the name of the hon. Alderman (Thompson), who was the only Bank Director who had a seat in that House?

Lord *Althorp* said, he had omitted him for that very reason—of his being a Director; for as he thought that the question related to a renewal of the Charter, it would not be proper to place on it any Director.

Mr. *Baring* said, that one individual in a Committee of thirty-one could not influence its decision, but it would evidently facilitate the inquiries of the Committee to have a Bank Director upon it.

Lord *Althorp* said, that it was only motives of delicacy that prevented him from naming the hon. Alderman, whom, if he were not a Director, he would gladly have selected. However, as it appeared to be the opinion of several of the Gentlemen that it would be a convenience to the Committee to have the hon. Alderman one of its members, he should not object to it.

Mr. Alderman Thompson added to the Committee.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Wednesday, May 23, 1832.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Duke of DEVONSHIRE, from Derby, in favour of the Factories Regulation Bill.—By the Earl of ROSEBERY, from Falkirk, in favour of the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill.

ARREARS OF TITHES (IRELAND).] Viscount Melbourne moved the Order of the Day for their Lordships to resolve themselves into a Committee on the Arrears of Tithes Bill.

The Earl of *Wicklow* was desirous of making some observations on the Bill before it went into a Committee, but, considering that very important business was to come on this evening, he did not mean to go into the subject at much length. Still he felt that he might be justified in entering, on the present occasion, into a discussion of the whole subject of tithes, as connected with Ireland; a subject of the first importance with reference to that country, and which had, notwithstanding, been ill managed and much neglected. He would, however, confine himself at present to the particular object of the Bill, which was that of enabling the Government to pay certain proportions of the uncollected tithes to the Clergy out of the Consolidated Fund, and to authorise the Government itself to collect the arrears of tithes for the repayment of the sum advanced. Now the Tithe Committee had made its report, recommending this measure, in February, and yet the Bill was only in progress through this House at the end of May. The Committee, too, had only made this one report, and although it still continued in existence, it had received no more evidence than had been given in the course of one week. The subject had, therefore, been much neglected and ill managed. The report had recommended the total extinction of tithes in Ireland, and had, on that account, been productive of effects on the collecting of the tithes already due. It might be said, in fact, to have operated as a total suspension of the payment of tithes. When tithes were applied for, those who ought to pay, either were, or affected to be, astonished that such a demand should be made, and asked whether the Legislature had not put an end to the payment of tithes? As to the present Bill, he admitted, that if it had been passed at an earlier period, it would have been attended with very beneficial results; but the delay had allowed the evil to reach to such an extent, that if the contemplated payments were to be made to all the clergy, they would hardly be sufficient to supply them with a single meal. With this feeling he did not think the Bill of much importance as far as it related to these payments. But there was no reason why those who ought to have paid the tithes should not be compelled to pay them, and it was proper and necessary that the Government itself should compel these Reformers to pay, and that the law should by that means prevent an immediate collision between the Clergy and the Reformers. This law authorised and required the Government to exert its power, and enforce the payment of the arrears of tithes, for the reimbursement to the Consolidated Fund of the money advanced to the Irish clergy, for it was only a loan, and payment of it ought to be made imperative on those who ought to pay. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would not suffer any mistaken leniency or temporizing policy, or attempts at conciliation, to interfere with the enforcing payment from those from whom tithes were due, and he trusted that it would unflinchingly compel the payment of all the arrears. He said so, because he was informed that, in some of the disturbed districts, it was intended to resist the payment of the tithes under this Bill. When they went into the Committee, he would suggest some amendments for the consideration of the noble Viscount (Melbourne); and chiefly he would suggest, that the Government should be armed with additional powers to enforce the payment. By this Bill they had even less power to enforce payment, than the clergy themselves enjoyed, for there was no provision to enable the Government to make those who resisted the payment, liable in costs. The Bill ought to contain a provision to give the Government power to compel these Reformers to pay costs, otherwise they would persist, if it were only to put the clergy to expense. As the Bill stood, the proceedings to enforce payment from those who resisted, would be attended with no expense to those who had refused, and it would be ruinous to the clergy. He would suggest amendments in these points to which he alluded, but he would merely suggest them without proposing them himself, lest he should delay the progress of the Bill, which he was most anxious to have passed as soon as possible.

Viscount *Melbourne* did not think the complaints of the noble Earl, as to the neglect in carrying forward the Bill, well founded, for it had advanced as fast as circumstances permitted. He had been anxious to proceed with the Bill in this House with all possible despatch; but the Bill had been delayed by the proceedings of the noble Earl himself, who had declared that he had amendments to propose. The consequence of that declaration was, that the Bill was necessarily postponed; and, if it had not been for that declaration, it would have been before this time passed into a law. As to the proceedings of the Committee, he did submit that, considering the magnitude of the subject, and all the circumstances, the proceedings had advanced as far as could well be expected. Under the circumstances in which the Government had been lately placed, it could not have been expected that they should bring forward a measure to settle the important question of Irish tithes. He was in hopes, however, they would soon be in a condition to propose a measure which would effectually prevent a collision between the clergy and the immediate occupier of the soil. As to the statements of the noble Earl, about resistance to the legal demands of the clergy, he would only say, that the Government was prepared to enforce those demands, and that it was intended to arm the Government with all the powers necessary to give effect to its purpose. As to the matter of costs, this was in the nature of a proceeding on the part of the Crown, which, by the common law, neither paid nor took costs; but the Government was armed with a power to take summary steps to enforce payment; and the power, he hoped, would be sufficient for the purpose.

House in Committee.—Clauses of the Bill read and agreed to.—House resumed.

TITHES (IRELAND) PETITIONS.] Lord *King* presented a Petition from several landowners and others, of a district in the Queen's County, praying for an alteration in the Tithe System. Some observations had been made, about the payment of costs, and the proceedings of the courts; but these petitioners stated, that when the assistant Barrister had decided in their favour, he had been forced by the Ecclesiastical Court to reverse that decision. There was no great justice in that, nor could the payers of tithes well expect justice when the clergymen were judges in their own cause. Tithes constituted a tax of the worst description, and it was a tax which ought to be abolished.

Lord *Wynford* thought, that little reliance could be placed on the statements of facts made by these petitioners, for they were most clearly mistaken as to the law. The Ecclesiastical Courts had no jurisdiction, either in Ireland or England, to meddle with the decisions of the Common Law Judges.

Lord *King* repeated, that tithes were manifestly a most oppressive tax, and one of the worst kind, since a great deal more was paid by the occupier of land than came into the pockets of the clergy. The proctor intervened, and had an interest in enforcing the payment of tithes in the most oppressive manner.

The Marquess of *Salisbury* could not understand the object of the noble Baron in making these never-ending attacks upon the Church and its endowments. Whatever that object was, the noble Lord's conduct neither conduced to support the dignity of the House, nor was it creditable to the noble Lord. He would tell the noble Lord that the tithe was not a tax. It was property, and the property of the Church, to which the clergy had as much right, as the noble Lord to his rents. Whenever the time came that this was not the case, if tithes fell rents would soon follow, and those who exacted high rents would be the first to fall. How would the noble Lord like his tenants to petition that House against the noble Lord's exaction of rent? The cases as to petitions respecting rent and tithes were exactly similar.

The Bishop of *London* said, that the clergy seldom exacted above two-thirds of what they were justly entitled to. The noble Lord (King) made complaints of the interference and cost of tithe proctors in Ireland. But he would ask what occasioned the interference but the refusal of the party to pay what was legally due?

Lord *King* had but one observation to make upon what had fallen from the noble Marquess opposite (the Marq. of Salisbury). He (Lord King) should have no objection to any visitation upon those who exacted high rents from their tenants. He should not suffer by that, and he hoped it would be the same with the noble Marquess.

The Marquess of *Salisbury* did not mean to reproach the noble Lord on the score of high rents; neither had he to reproach himself upon any such ground. At all events he was confident, that he never exacted from his tenants payment in gold when the guinea was worth 28*s*.

Petition laid on the Table.

Lord *King* said, fortunately he had other petitions to present, which would afford him an opportunity of answering the observations of the noble Marquess. In the first place he maintained that tithe was a tax, and one of the worst sort, because it was levied on gross produce. Next, he did not deny, that tithe was property; but then it was public property, the property of the individual for the time being, but after his death to be dealt with as all other public property was liable to be dealt with. As to the allusion made by the noble Marquess to his having demanded gold in payment of his rent, he could easily explain that. He had not brought his action against a poor tenant, but against a Bank Director, whom he had the good fortune to have for a tenant at the time that an individual in the other House, who probably was at that moment in their Lordships' House, had thought fit to get a resolution passed, that a Bank note and a shilling were equal in value to a guinea in gold. He was determined to prove the fallacy of that resolution of the minister of the day; and therefore, and therefore only, had he taken the course remarked upon by the noble Marquess. To that fatal mistake of borrowing largely in a depreciated paper currency, and paying in metal, he attributed all the evils the country was labouring under. The nation was then drunk with its supposed wealth; but it was now paying dearly for the folly, or rather the knavery, with which the affairs of the country were then governed.

The Bishop of *London* could not permit the noble Lord's assertion, that the tithes were public property, to pass uncontradicted. He denied that they ought to be so viewed, or that the public had the power to resume property devoted to the Church. The public were entitled to see that the property of the Church was properly applied, but that was all. He should like to ask the noble Lord whether he was of opinion that if he made a testamentary disposition of his property for the purpose of founding and supporting an institution for the relief of decayed clergymen, it would be legal or equitable in the Legislature, at the end of a century, to divert that property from its purpose?

Lord *Bexley* hoped that the noble Lord paid his debts in gold, as he exacted the payments made to him in that metal. The resolution of the other House to which he had referred, had been affirmed by a Jury, which, he thought, proved it was not so absurd as the noble Lord seemed disposed to represent it.

Lord *King* said, he always paid in ready money, and therefore he paid the market price at the time of making the contract whatever it was. He had several other petitions respecting tithes to present, and would be ready to meet the right reverend Prelate in discussion upon the nature of Church property whenever he pleased. The noble Lord concluded by presenting several petitions from different places in Ireland, which were laid upon the Table.

NAVY CIVIL DEPARTMENTS BILL.] Lord *Auckland* in moving the second reading of the Navy Civil Departments Consolidation Bill explained, that the object of this Bill was to bring the different offices for the management of the business of the navy, which were at present partly at the Admiralty, and partly at Somerset House, under one roof, and place them under one Board. The advantage of this arrangement would be increased despatch in the business, and a considerable saving of expense.

Lord *Ellenborough* was prepared to urge many objections to the measure, and was bound to say, that he entertained serious doubts of its policy. It was impossible, for example, that any naval men, however distinguished in their own profession, should be such good accountants, or so fit to form members of civil Boards, as persons whose education had been calculated for such duties. When he looked to the exploits of the British navy during the last 130 years, it did occur to him, that there could be no need of change in that department of the public service. But it appeared that all our institutions were to undergo some change in these times, with or without reason; and it might probably be shewn by some advocate of change, that if the alterations now in contemplation had been made earlier, we should have had better victories over the enemy, and more of them, than we had reason to boast of during the period he had mentioned. He had heard no reasons whatever assigned for such a sweeping alteration, except the advantage of transacting business without having any subsidiary Boards to record and check the proceedings of the Admiralty. He, however, thought it was a great security for the due performance of public duties when the highest officers were obliged to give their orders in writing. The Navy Board was composed of practical men of business, conversant with all the details of dock-yards and ship building, and he could not for one moment imagine, that Lords of the Admiralty, who were generally naval men of high reputation, and gentlemen of parliamentary influence, could effectually perform their duties. He doubted the advantages of their proposed measure, but should not oppose the Motion.

Lord *Napier* thought the noble Baron had entirely misunderstood or forgotten the principle of the Bill. The noble Baron had stated, that he did not conceive naval men were fit to conduct the civil departments of the navy.

Lord *Ellenborough*, interrupting the noble Lord: he had simply said, that naval officers, however efficient in their business, were not of necessity the fittest persons to place at the head of civil departments involving the duties of accountants.

Lord *Napier* considered that argument to be as applicable in favour of his proposition as in favour of that of the noble Baron. Professional men he considered, to be as capable of conducting the business of the country as any Member of their Lordships' House. Indeed, he had no doubt that, when the noble Baron himself had seen the greatest Captain of the age holding the highest civil office, he considered him the fittest person for that office. That illustrious individual had evidently held similar opinions; for, during the time he held office, he bestowed a large number of civil situations upon military men. His (Lord Napier's) individual opinion was, that men of that character formed much more able and efficient men of business than others, and would do more duty in ten minutes than any noble Lord, who had been brought up in the public offices, would in as many hours. The noble Baron had talked about responsibility and checks: to him it appeared perfectly immaterial whether that responsibility rested with the head of the Admiralty, or with the head of the Victualling Department. The regard to personal character was quite sufficient to ensure the proper discharge of the duties of any office. Nelson once said, "England expects every man to do his duty," he hoped that every man would so act in the fulfilment of the duties attached to his situation; and, if he did not, he was amenable to the laws. It had been his intention to have reserved his observations on the Bill until it had arrived in Committee, but he felt himself bound to say a few words in consequence of some remarks made in another place, deeply affecting the professional character of a gallant and intelligent friend of his, who neither was nor could be, present to defend himself. The attack on that gallant officer's character had gone throughout the country, and he was, consequently, suffering a degree of obloquy equally severe and unjust. He alluded to what had been said in the other House by that highly respectable and gallant Admiral who conducted the business of the Navy Board for many years. It had been stated by the late Comptroller of the Navy, in reference to his gallant friend, Captain Symonds, who had been lately appointed to the office of Surveyor of the Navy, that he was altogether ignorant of the duties of his office. That, in this great maritime country, a reforming Administration should have appointed a man to superintend the construction of ships, upon which the security and honour of the country depended—that any report even of that nature should have gone abroad—was most astonishing. That assertion was a calumny which he could not allow to remain uncontradicted. Having had the pleasure of knowing Captain Symonds for many years, he would take upon himself to say, that there was not a better officer than Captain Symonds in all the British navy. His noble friend (Lord Vernon), who had been the first to discover the great peculiar talents and qualifications of Captain Symonds—had employed him to build a yacht, the superiority of which, in every respect, was such that he was induced to bring forward that officer and recommend him to the Navy Board, who, after obtaining security from his (Lord Napier's) noble relative in a sum of 20,000*l.*, employed Captain Symonds to build a ship; at the same time, instructing Professor Inman, who was not a seaman, to do the same. Permission was also granted to Captain Hayes to build two or three ships—a gentleman who thought that he had made some discovery (which was now found to be fallacious) in naval architecture. It was to be observed, however, that the two latter of these gentlemen were not called upon to give any security for the expense which might be incurred in carrying their plans into execution. When these ships, together with others, built by the then Surveyor of the Navy went to sea in 1827, it was proved, as was perfectly well known to every man who had at all entered into the statements of the case, that the ship built by Captain Symonds was far superior to any of the rest of the squadron, and that that constructed by the then Surveyor of the Navy was the very worst. He was in possession of an extract from a letter written to him by the flag-lieutenant of that ship, in which he pointed out the different properties of all the ships which composed the squadron, and he stated it as his opinion, and that of every body in the fleet, that Captain Symonds's ship was by far the best, and Sir Robert Seppings's was the very worst. It was not his wish to say anything prejudicial to that gentleman—Sir Robert Seppings was a most industrious individual, who had faithfully and well discharged the duties of Surveyor of the Navy for the last thirty years, and, moreover, he was an eminent and distinguished shipwright, who had introduced several highly beneficial improvements into the construction of ships. For instance, Sir Robert Seppings invented the system of diagonal fastening, the object of which was, to equalize the strength of every part of a ship, and thus to obviate the highly injurious effects of weakness in a particular place, which, previously to its introduction, produced what was known by the term "hogging." The same gentleman also suggested the plan of building masts by connecting a number of small portions together, instead of five larger spars, as customary heretofore. He also first introduced round sterns, although, that he invented them could not be said; for, if their Lordships cast their eyes on the tapestry which covered the walls, they would see several beautiful examples of round sterns. It had been said in the other House, that the name of Sir Robert Seppings was known over the whole world, as the greatest naval architect and improver that ever lived. He was perfectly ready to give that individual all due praise, but he could not allow it to be said, that he was the author of every improvement which had taken place in the navy of late years. In fact, a great number of these improvements had been suggested by Admirals, Captains, and other officers in the navy—many of them humble individuals, whose names were unknown to their Lordships, and who had not even received the thanks of the Navy Board for their inventions. In this respect a great deal of good was likely to arise out of this Bill; for, when officers went to the Admiralty with their plans, the system now to be established would afford them a likelihood of being heard, and, if successful, of being rewarded; whereas, the individual who now presented himself with plans of any alteration or invention to the Navy Board, met with the most uncourteous reception, because his application was made to jealous rivals. He had heard over and over again the strongest complaints from his brother officers in this respect. During the period which he had had the honour of being in the navy (about thirty years), its condition had been greatly improved, principally by means of alterations suggested by officers in the navy, who having the opportunity of practically observing various defects in their ships, were the better enabled to remedy them. Very great improvements had also been made in the equipments of vessels. The first which he could then recollect was, the introduction of iron tanks as receptacles for the water in the stead of casks. By whom was that suggested? Any one connected with the Navy Board? No; by General Bentham. The next he would mention was, the employment of chain cables, the great superiority of which over the old rope cables no one now denied. Yet, when these were first proposed, every possible objection was raised by the Navy Board against their introduction. And who invented them? Any one belonging to that Board? Certainly not; it was Samuel Brown, a Captain in the royal navy. They were found to be so much superior to rope cables as actually, in many instances, to break the anchors, instead of being, as was frequently the case with the rope cables, which they superseded, snapt asunder. It became, therefore, necessary, if possible, to improve the anchors; which was, accordingly, attempted by the Navy Board. How far they succeeded in that attempt might be imagined, when he stated that the anchors made according to their improved system would be found even worse than those which had been in use for many years. And why was this? Simply for this reason; that there was not, among the whole of the members composing that Board, a single individual capable of constructing an anchor on sound mechanical principles. Plans were laid before the Board by a very meritorious officer, with whom he was acquainted, who had for many years devoted his whole time and attention to the subject—and how were these plans received? They encountered the greatest opposition. In fact, it was the reproach of the Navy Board, that neither he, nor any other inventors, were ever, in the slightest degree, encouraged by that Board, so as to enable the country to enjoy the benefit of their inventions. This was an additional reason for consolidating the two Boards into one—that officers might be enabled to submit their plans to the direct and immediate inspection of the Board of Admiralty itself, and thus feel confident that they would be fairly and justly dealt with. This Bill would be productive of very great and eminent improvements in the whole conduct of the business of the navy, and he knew that to be the opinion held by a large number of officers—men possessing the very best information on the subject. In the very first conversation which he had had with the right hon. Baronet at the head of the Admiralty, he had stated to that right hon. Gentleman, that, until he knocked the Navy Board on the head, he would never be able to do any good at the Board of Admiralty. He, therefore, was quite ready to give his hearty support to this Bill, which, by getting rid of two subordinate Boards, and placing the undivided control and responsibility in the Admiralty, would be found to be productive of the greatest advantages to the naval service.

Lord *Colville* must beg, in the first place, to observe, that the allusion which his noble friend had made to the late Comptroller of the Navy had surprised him greatly. The subject was one wholly irrelevant to the matter before the House. As the noble Lord, however, had brought it forward, he would take the opportunity of observing, with respect to what was said elsewhere by the late Comptroller of the Navy, on the subject of Captain Symonds, that he never heard a warmer eulogium than the one which was bestowed upon that Officer in the House of Commons. Their Lordships had all of them access to that House, and the means of knowing what passsed there; and what the late Comptroller of the Navy had said of Captain Symonds was, that he was a most meritorious officer, but that he was not so well calculated to fill the office of Surveyor of the Navy as would be some man who had been bred to the duties of that branch of the profession. He would also observe, that, under the Administration of the noble Viscount who lately presided at the Admiralty, a school had been established for the express purpose of furnishing the country with persons duly qualified to hold the office of Surveyor of the Navy; and from the pupils of which it might have more reasonably been expected that that officer would have been selected, than from the navy. With respect to the measure itself, the second reading of which was now proposed, his noble friend (Lord Ellenborough) had expressed so much better than he (Lord Colville) could do, what were his sentiments upon it, that he would merely state, that he regretted his inability to arrest the progress of this Bill. As an Officer who had spent his best days in the navy, he considered himself called upon not to remain silent on the passing of a measure so deeply and vitally affecting its most important interests. He was no enemy to the Reform of any department of the public service in which it was required; but this Bill went too far; it was Reform on too extensive a scale. The business of the navy could not be properly conducted without the assistance of at least one Civil Board. It might, perhaps, have been judicious to have consolidated the Navy and Victualling Boards; but how could they go further, unless the Navy Board were placed more strictly under the Admiralty than it even now was. In his opinion, the Navy Board had always been a most efficient and useful Board; it had always acted as a wholesome check upon the proceedings of the Board of Admiralty, or, in the language which was made use of in another place by a gallant Officer who belonged to the late Board, "it has always acted as a wholesome drag," and, on some occasions, as a most proper drag upon the Admiralty. Thus, it was a most useful establishment; but it was unpopular, indeed, because it frequently interposed for the purpose of preventing, on the part of the Admiralty, a too ready compliance with the wishes of naval officers and others who were desirous of introducing changes and alterations which they considered improvements, but which would be very likely to lead the public into great and useless expense. With regard to the details of the Bill, any observations which he might wish to make, would be more properly made in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

Parliamentary Reform — Bill for England—Committee—Fourth Day.] On the Motion of Earl Grey, the House resolved itself into a Committee on the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill, and the question being put that Dudley stand part of schedule D,

Lord *Ellenborough* objected to this place being included in the schedule, because it lay in a district which had already too many Representatives; it lay in the same district of country as Birmingham, Wolverhampton, and Walsall; it had the same interests as those places, and the part of the country in which they were placed would, under the present Bill, have one Member for every 22,000 inhabitants, whereas other and adjoining districts were only to have one Member to 62,000. He alluded to Worcestershire, to which county, as Dudley, though seated in it, was connected by interests with Staffordshire and Warwickshire, an act of gross injustice was committed, which would give its inhabitants great grounds of complaint, the more so that those districts which were to receive the fewest Members were in a higher state of improvement than those which were to be allowed to return the greater number. It appeared as if the Members for that quarter of the country had been put into a bag, which, having burst, they had all fallen in one direction, and, by the laws of gravitation, in Birmingham and other strong holds of the Political Unions.

The Earl of *Radnor* considered Dudley fully entitled from its wealth and population, to a Representative. As to the noble Baron's remark about Worcestershire, he must remind him that Dudley was in Worcestershire, and would he then deprive it of the additional Representative?

Lord *Ellenborough* repeated, that this was setting a bad example to the other districts, and would afford them great ground for complaint: it was like dividing the country into electoral districts.

Lord *King* denied, that there was the slightest appearance of an intention to divide the county into electoral districts, either according to wealth or population. Such would not be the effect of the Bill. He thought that great jealousy was displayed in enfranchising the great towns, and that landed property had too much while the large towns possessed too little of the Representation. He believed that the landed property of the country did not amount to one half the value of the personal property, and would remind their Lordships, in proof of this assertion of the fact, that in one year legacy duty was paid upon 48,000,000*l.* of personal property. Taking the duration of a generation at thirty-three years, and multiplying 48,000,000*l.* by 33, it gave nearly 1,600,000,000*l.* as the amount of personal property in this country, which, at five per cent interest, gave an annual income of upwards of 75,000,000*l.* derived from personal property. That was much more, he believed, than double the amount of the landed rent of the country. That personal property, too, be it remembered, excluded wages of labour, and the income of professional men. He believed, too, he might take the rate of interest higher, say, seven and a half per cent, and, at that rate, the personal property of the country would exceed the revenue of the land in the proportion of nearly four to one. Under these circumstances, he contended, that the towns, instead of being over-represented, would have less than their share of the franchise, as compared with the landed interest, and proceeding upon the consideration, not of population, but of wealth.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* was not prepared to meet the noble Baron on all the statements which he had made, but his estimate certainly underrated the importance of the landed interest. Perhaps the noble Baron was not aware, that during the existence of the Property-tax, that tax yielded an annual revenue of 8,000,000*l.* Perhaps he was not aware, also, that the gross amount of produce raised by the agricultural interest amounted to 216,000,000*l.*, 40,000,000*l.* of which was laid out in labour. With these facts before him, it could scarcely be denied that the landed interest of the country was the most important of the two. He must disclaim all intention or wish to keep back the manufacturing interest from a just share in the Representation. He had never said, and never thought, that it ought not to be represented; but what he had always maintained was, that by the present Bill it would have more than its fair proportion in the Representative system, and that the measure, when carried into operation, would prove highly injurious to the landed and agricultural interests.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* did not know upon what ground the noble Baron opposite had assumed, for certainly his observations went to that effect, that the large towns and manufacturing districts contained the greater proportion of the personal property of the country. He seemed to suppose, that the whole of it was in the hands of the 10*l.* voters of Birmingham and other manufacturing towns, whereas a very considerable portion of it was in the hands of the enterprising and intelligent agriculturists. He must beg leave to enter his protest against the noble Lord's argument, which proceeded altogether on the supposition that all personal property was in the hands of the inhabitants of towns.

The *Lord Chancellor* observed, that Dudley was a town of consequence, containing 23,000 inhabitants, and 800 voters under the 10*l.* franchise; and, besides having a good general trade, was extensively connected with the iron trade, in the manufacture of nails, by which upwards of 40,000 operatives, resident in the town and neighbourhood, were kept in constant employment. He contended that, under all the circumstances attached and relative to the town of Dudley, it, from its population and trade, in connexion with the iron manufacture, was entitled to return Members to represent it in the Commons House of Parliament, in the same way as Leeds and Frome, connected as they were with the woollen manufacture, and Manchester, in connexion with the cotton trade, were entitled.

The question that "Dudley (Worcestershire), stand part of schedule D," agreed to.

It was also agreed, that Frome (Somersetshire) stand part of schedule D.

On the question that Gateshead (Durham) stand part of the Bill,

The Marquess of *Londonderry* objected to the elective franchise being extended to the town of Gateshead, because he conceived, that the county of Durham was already sufficiently represented, and because the extension of the franchise would tend only to increase the Whig interest, which already predominated in that county. He admitted he was unequal to enter into a debate upon this subject, or to deal with the details of the proposed measure in reference to the question now before their Lordships; and all he should endeavour to do, therefore, was, to give expression to his own sentiments, as well as those of a vast proportion of the wealth, talent, and property of the county of Durham, with which he was himself so closely connected. He did not mean to impute anything to the noble Lords opposite, but when he saw the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government, though little more than twelve months in office, showering down situations, places, and preferments upon members of his own family, even to the extent of one of the most valuable of the bishopricks; and when he also witnessed the acquisition of blue ribands, and other ribands and honours, within the same short space of time, in a manner not at all palatable to the public, he was induced to look with a scrupulous eye to other parts of their conduct. In that view he came to consider the case of the county of Durham, as affected by the provisions of the Bill now under discussion, and he found that, out of the ten Members given to the county of Durham, eight were allocated to the northern, which was the smallest, division of the county, and only two Members reserved for the southern and largest district. This distribution he considered to be unfair and unjust; but it was probably accounted for, when it was remembered that the property of the noble Baron opposite (Lord Durham) was situated in the northern wards of the county. Of the selection made of the towns, too, he also complained. South Shields, for instance, a town which it would seem was high in favour with the noble Baron, was in no respect whatever entitled to a Representation in preference to, and in exclusion of, the town of Stockton-upon-Tees. The town of Gateshead, which it was now proposed to their Lordships to give a Representative to, was situate in the midst of the numerous and extensive collieries of the noble Baron, and was surrounded by the immense body of labourers and operatives to which those collieries afforded employment. It was clear, that the noble Baron must have a great influence in the return of the members for Sunderland, South Shields, and Gateshead. Nor was that all. If by the Bill the voters for towns were also to be made voters for counties, it was clear, that the noble Baron would also have a great influence over the votes for the northern part of the county. It was his firm belief, that out of the eight Members which by this arrangement were to be given to the northern part of the county of Durham, the noble Baron would have the power of procuring the return of seven. In the other part of the county was situated the property of a noble Marquis, whom he did not see in his place, and it was quite evident to him, as he thought it must be to most of their Lordships, that it would be impossible for any other interest but those of the two noble individuals to whom he had alluded, to succeed in a contest for the Representation of those towns, or of the county. But he would then inquire why, or on what grounds, it was, that the town of Gateshead had been selected by the noble Baron opposite. Gateshead possessed nothing to recommend it: it was a mere suburb to the town of Newcastle —a most filthy spot, containing the vilest class of society, and that description of population least worthy to enjoy the right of voting for a Member to serve in Parliament. He could not give their Lordships a better proof of the description of the inhabitants of the town of Gateshead, than by alluding to the effects produced in that town by the visitation of the malady called cholera, the ravages of which were so extraordinary, as to exceed, in three days, all that occurred in all England in the same space of time. He could not but advocate the claims of the town of Stockton-upon-Tees, in preference to those of Gateshead. The former contained a most intelligent, respectable, and wealthy population; and he should be glad to hear what reason could be given why it should not be included in the proposed Representation in preference to the latter town. He held in his hand a small map of the county of Durham, and, on a reference to it, noble Lords would find, that in a small radius of four and a half miles, the noble Baron opposite had created no less than four new boroughs and seven Representatives. With the present state of the House, he saw no prospect of success, should he proceed to a division on the question; he, however, could not refrain from expressing to the noble Baron his view with respect to the county, with which, let what would happen, the noble Baron had direct interests. What he would propose was, that Stockton should have a Member in lieu of Gateshead; and though, as he hoped, the Government should consent to relieve the counties from the town voters, it would be an extremely good arrangement to attach the Wearmouths to Sunderland, and thereby relieve the Easington Ward, from the freeholders in them, and so give the agricultural interest fair play. He should then recommend that they put Easington and Stockton Wards together, and Chester and Darlington, which, he thought, would be a much more acceptable division of the county than that proposed by the noble Baron. He could not avoid adding, in conclusion, that the claims of Stockton-upon-Tees were much greater than those of Walsall to a Representative, though the one obtained what was refused to the other. He admitted that the former did not present claims equal to those of many inland towns, such as Doncaster, and many others; but, considering its maritime situation and increasing trade, as well as the knowledge and scientific acquirements of its inhabitants, it was well entitled to a Representative. He should not, in the present state of the House trouble their Lordships to divide, but he would move that Stockton-upon-Tees be substituted for Gateshead.

Lord *Durham:* My Lords, I return my most sincere thanks to the noble Marquess for the opportunity which he has afforded me of giving some explanation upon the subject of the borough of Gateshead, and of removing any unfavourable impression which may have been created, either out of this House, or in the mind of the noble Marquess himself; and I trust that I shall satisfactorily prove, before I have done, that the information on which he has founded his observations this evening is in every respect extremely incorrect, to say the least of it. But, first, I must congratulate the noble Lord on having followed the example of his noble friend near him (Ellenborough.) His noble friend opposite me, after having opposed the Bill and Reform, both in principle, and in all its details, at length, to the astonishment, not only of this side of the House, but to the still greater surprise of his friends, came forward with a plan of Reform of his own, and that, too, of a very large, and, in some respects, more extensive nature than that which had been proposed by his Majesty's Ministers; and now comes the noble Lord, and presents us this night with his small pocket provincial plan of Reform. Whether he will be more successful in procuring its adoption than his noble friend has been with his, I cannot presume to declare; but I think I shall show that the noble Lord has adduced no more reasonable grounds for expecting any support from this House than did his noble friend (Ellenborough), on the occasion to which I have referred. But while I congratulate him on having become a Reformer at last, and of having brought forward his duodecimo plan for reforming the county of Durham, I cannot say, that it appears to me to be such a one as this House could possibly adopt with any regard to principle or to justice. The noble Lord has said, that the boroughs of the county of Durham were arranged on a plan to give an undue influence to the Whig party; and though he disclaimed imputing to me the arrangement with the express view of increasing my own influence in the county, yet he has charged me with not having attempted to prevent that interest being materially favoured, and has been pleased to regret that it had all the appearance of having been adopted, in order to give me a great political predominance in that county. Now, I really wish the noble Lord would for once imagine, that it is barely possible that an individual can be engaged in a great public measure without having any reference to his own private interests. I wish he could entertain a better opinion of human nature than to suppose that a man called upon to assist, either as a member of the Government, or as a Peer in Parliament, in effecting a great and important political measure, must necessarily apply himself, not to that honourable purpose, but to the attainment of his own private objects, and the promotion of his own personal interests.

I confess, my Lords, I am almost ashamed at having felt it even necessary to repel these insinuations, not only for myself, but for my colleagues; for even if I had been base enough to endeavour to persuade them to consent to an arrangement of such a nature, is it likely that they would ever have lent themselves to such a proceeding—would ever have become accessaries to any such act? I freely admit, that the noble Lord is right in his conjecture, that in framing this measure I took a considerable share, and devoted much time and attention to it; I am, therefore, the better enabled to tell the noble Lord on what principle it was based, and how utterly impossible it was, that any other arrangement could have been effected, with any regard to justice. It having been resolved to act upon the principle of abolishing all rotten boroughs, —having, I say, established, as the first principle of the Bill, that all nomination boroughs should be destroyed, we next proceeded to consider how the advantage of Representation could be extended to the rest of the country; and we found, that it was not possible to take any distinct principle but that of giving the franchise to all towns containing a great population. This being the opinion of my colleagues, it was then decided, that as it was necessary to draw some line which should exclude all notion of partiality in their selection, all towns containing 20,000 inhabitants should return two Members, and all towns containing 10,000 inhabitants should return one Member. This being the arrangement fixed upon, after mature consideration, and on general principles, I ask the noble Lord, how I could require that Gateshead, Shields, and Sunderland, though coming within the line, were to be excluded, because it happened that these places were in that part of the country in which I resided. How could I ask of my colleagues to do such an act of injustice towards these towns, as to exclude them from the general plan? and how could they have acted so, even if I had been unjust enough to make the request? That each of these towns come within the line which I have stated, and that they are, therefore, fully entitled to be represented in Parliament, I think, before I sit down, I shall be able to show, to the satisfaction, if not, perhaps, of the noble Lord, at least to that of this House.

And now, my Lords, as to the number of Members which has been allotted to the county of Durham generally. If your Lordships will consider the amount of the population of that county, I am sure you will be convinced that it will not receive more than it is at the present moment entitled to. If the noble Lord will attend to that part of the history of this country which relates to its parliamentary Representation, he will find that Members were first returned from that county in the time of Charles 2nd, after many previous unsuccessful attempts, on the part of the inhabitants, to acquire Representation. In the year 1614, a bill was brought into Parliament to enable that county to return two Members; also, two for the city of Durham; and to create five other boroughs which were to have two Members each. This was at a time when the population was much less than it is at this day, and it may, perhaps, surprise the noble Lord to hear, that the town and borough of Gateshead was among the places it was then proposed to enfranchise. That bill was lost in consequence of a dissolution of Parliament. Subsequently, however, the attempt was renewed; but it was always opposed by the Bishops of the diocese, who having, in those days, the right of summoning a kind of Parliament of their own, never could be prevailed upon to give up their privileges. At last, during a vacancy of the see, a portion of that bill was obtained in the 25th of Charles 2nd, and four Members were allotted to the county and city of Durham. So much, my Lords, for the general history of its Representation.

And now I will address myself more particularly to the case of Gateshead: and, in the first place, I beg distinctly to tell the noble Lord, that when the application was made by the borough of Gateshead to have Members given to it, so far from its being made at my instance, I assure him I was perfectly ignorant that any claim had been preferred. The memorial of Gateshead, dated the 25th of January, 1831, was addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and claimed, on behalf of the inhabitants, their share in the new Representation about to be granted, as they understood, to the populous towns of the empire. My Lords, what is the nature of that claim? Its population amounts to 15,300; it pays in assessed taxes 2,006*l.* annually; and it contains 750 10*l.* houses.

Here I must beg your Lordships' attention to the position of Gateshead in point of population, the amount of assessed taxes paid, the number of 10*l.* houses, and Lieutenant Drummond's test, with reference to the other boroughs contained in schedule D. It is superior in population to Walsall, Wakefield, Kendal, Frome, and Whitby; in assessed taxes, to Whitehaven, Oldham, Frome, Shields, Merthyr Tydvil, and Ashton; in 10*l.* houses, to Kendal, Blackburn, Ashton, Kidderminster, Whitby, and Frome; by Lieutenant Drummond's test, to Kendal, Walsall, Ashton, Whitby, and Frome. But, my Lords, I will make a still severer comparison—I have taken out fifty-three of the most important towns in the empire, and applied to them Lieutenant Drummond's test, and whatever may be the towns to be excluded from the schedules C and D, according to that principle, Gateshead is not one; on the contrary, it stands fortieth on the list; forty-two being the number, two being inferior, and one of them, the very town named by the noble Lord; namely, Doncaster. But with reference to Stockton-on-Tees, which the noble Lord wishes to substitute for Gateshead, I think the fact which I am now about to state will prove upon what little regard to principle that arrangement must have proceeded, had it included Stockton and excluded Gateshead. In 1821 the population of Gateshead was 11,765—1,765 above the line of 10,000; while the population of Stockton was 5006, nearly 5,000 below it. At the present moment the population of Gateshead is 15,177, and that of Stockton is 7,991.

As the noble Marquess has indulged in a great number of insinuations with regard to the increase of the boroughs in the northern districts of the county of Durham, I must remark, that this circumstance is owing to the fact of the mines being situated in that district; in consequence of which, manufactures, and trade, and commerce, have become attached to that locality, and large towns have sprung up in the vicinage of each other. Unless, then, you apply a different principle with regard to the county of Durham to that which governs the distribution of the Representation to other counties, you must take as the criterion for determining the number of Members to be given to it, the large towns which are situate in it; and as it happens that they are in the northern district, the new Members are necessarily allotted to that district. The same fact appears in the state of the new Representation of the mining districts on the borders of Yorkshire and Lancashire, and to a much greater extent. The Durham mining and manufacturing district receives four boroughs and five Members; the Yorkshire and Lancashire corner receives twelve boroughs and seventeen Members—a much greater number than Durham, in proportion to the extent of the district. The increase, in both instances, has arisen because these large towns have gradually sprung up, and have increased in population, trade and wealth;

and surely, my Lords, we could not, with the least appearance of justice, have excluded any of these towns from the present arrangement, merely because they happen to have the misfortune of being situated in my neighbourhood. It would have been an act of the grossest injustice, and one which, I am confident, the great majority of your Lordships would have strongly reprobated.

The noble Marquess objects to those towns receiving Representatives, because, he says, they will be subject to the influence of individuals. If the noble Marquess would change places with me, and it were possible that he could imbibe liberal principles, I still would defy him (I know I shall be myself unable) to return, by way of nomination, or in an indirect manner, or by any other cause arising from the possession of property in those places, a single Member for any of the towns in the county of Durham that are to be enfranchised. That the inhabitants of these towns may entertain a respect, and feel a sympathy, for my political opinions I do not intend to deny; indeed, I consider it a great honour to be favourably regarded by so large a number of my fellow countrymen in the north. I am well acquainted with their great commercial activity, I honour their political intelligence, and can bear testimony to their great respectability; and here I must protest against that indiscriminate abuse in which the noble Marquess has indulged when speaking of Gateshead and its inhabitants. I know a considerable number of them, and I know them to be men of wealth, talent, and respectability. The noble Lord says, they are persons whom I would not admit to my table; my Lords, I deny this. I have been accustomed, and always shall be proud, to live in habits of friendly intercourse with many of them, as indeed I hope I always shall with all my neighbours in the county, whatever may be their accidental station in the scale of society.

My Lords, I now come to another objection which has been urged by the noble Marquess—namely, that Gateshead is a suburb of Newcastle. I never, in my life, was more astonished than when I heard that assertion made. But the noble Lord has not even the merit of originality; he has been preceded in this attempt centuries ago by the Corporation of Newcastle, which has, ever since the year 1186, continually endeavoured to annex Gateshead to Newcastle. So far, however, from Gateshead being a part of Newcastle, it lies in a different county, pays different rates, and has a different jurisdiction. The noble Marquess has said, that most of the inhabitants of Gateshead are freemen of Newcastle. What is the real fact? The inhabitants of Gateshead are not only not free of the Corporation of Newcastle, but, on the contrary, one of the express laws of that Corporation is, that no freeman of that Corporation residing in Gateshead shall have the right or power of enfranchising his apprentices. Besides all this, such is the extreme jealousy entertained by Newcastle, that merchandize entering that town from Gateshead, pays a heavy toll to the Corporation of Newcastle. I appeal to my noble and learned friend near me (the Lord Chancellor), whether, when he went the northern circuit, the right of levying these tolls was not made the subject of legal investigation?

The *Lord Chancellor:* Yes; and I was engaged for eight hours on the trial, but without success.

Lord *Durham:* I have said, my Lords, that it has been the constant effort of the Corporation of Newcastle to make Gateshead into a suburb of that town, but which efforts have been as constantly resisted by the Bishops of Durham and the inhabitants of Gateshead. It is true, that, for a few months, and a few months only, during a period of more than 600 years, they succeeded, but under what circumstances? At the latter end of the reign of Edward 6th, Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, took possession of the revenues of the bishoprick of Durham, and dissolved the see. Gateshead was allotted by him to Newcastle in the division of the spoil. The preamble of the Act authorising that annexation recites, that "the town of Gatesyde is parcel both of the possession of the bishoprick of Durham, and also of the liberties and the county palatine of Durham;" and the reason assigned for the appropriation is, that rubbish is thrown into the river Tyne, of which the Corporation was conservator, and that offenders escape justice by going into another county. Against this Act Gateshead petitioned, and addressed "Master Bell, the Speaker of the Honourable House," setting forth the inconveniences which would result from this proceeding, and as all the reasons contained are quite as applicable to the present time, I shall read the petition. 'The town of Gateshead is 'within the county of Durham, and hath 'its liberties and customs granted by the 'Bishop's predecessors, and payeth all assessments for the repair of ways, bridges, 'charge to the wars, watches of the beacons, town and field watches, within the county of Durham.

'The town of Gateshead is ruled by the Bishop and burgesses, and hath good and wholesome constitutions and ordinances within themselves, and is as well governed for justice as they are in Newcastle. If it should be united to Newcastle, it would be replenished with evil-disposed persons and thieves, because it is without their walls, as is the north part of Newcastle. Whereas now, in Gateshead, there are a great number of substantial honest men, faithful and true subjects, as did appear in the late rebellion, some merchants, some drapers, and other honest artificers, whom the town of Newcastle doth envy, because they dwell so nigh unto them.'

Such was the petition which was presented to the House of Commons on that occasion, against the annexation of Gateshead to Newcastle. This state of things, however, lasted, as I said before, but a few months. The Act was repealed in the 1st of Mary, in the following terms; "Repeal of one Stat. 7 Ed. 6, c. 1, whereby the bishoprick of Durham was dissolved, and all the lands and possessions given to the King, and also of one other 7 Ed. 6, c. 10, whereby the town of Gatesyde was severed from the said bishoprick," &c.

Not content with this, Parliament came to a resolution upon the subject, which I will read to the noble Marquess, as it may be an inducement to him not to be too earnest in his opposition to the people of Gateshead, for fear the present Parliament should come to a similar resolution. In 1554, it was resolved in Parliament, "that it was a covetous disposition in Newcastle, and in no ways for the good of any." In 1575 and 1646, more attempts were made by the Corporation of Newcastle to make Gateshead a suburb, in which they again failed.

One word, my Lords, as to the trade of these two towns. It has been said by the noble Lord, that the trade of Gateshead is similar to that of Newcastle; it is, however, of a perfectly different description; there are great iron and brass founderies at Gateshead, such as do not exist in Newcastle. As to the appearance of the town, which the noble Marquess has described to be vile and filthy, I really must deny the correctness of that statement; but, indeed, his knowledge of the town can be little more than that which he has acquired while riding through the town when on a visit to Ravensworth Castle, which is in the immediate neighbourhood. It is possible that, when prancing through it on his Arabian, some filth may have attached itself to his horse or his person; but that the state of the town or inhabitants is, generally, such as he describes it, I deny. I have had more intimate opportunities of knowing the state of Gateshead than the noble Lord, having often canvassed it when I represented the county of Durham, and I can assure him and your Lordships, that it contains many and important manufactories, and is inhabited by persons of great industry, intelligence, and respectability. As a proof that there is not that degree of poverty existing in Gateshead, which the noble Marquis appears to believe, I can state that the average amount of its poor-rates has always been less than that of Newcastle. But, my Lords, all the arguments which I have been endeavouring to advance upon this subject are so much better summed up in the Report of the Commissioners, that I shall conclude what I have to say on this topic with quoting the Report itself. 'The circular part of the parish, on the river side, is thickly studded with manufactories and other buildings, and on the south western and north-western frontiers, compact masses of building are also to be found. Many houses have been recently erected in these parts, and many are now in progress. The bulk of the town, however, is to be found on each side of the great southern road. Gateshead is progressively and rapidly increasing in importance as a manufacturing district. Great grindstone quarries are situated in the midst of the parish, and within it are extensive manufactories of chain cables, heavy iron work, and steel; and also of glass and other valuable commodities. A rail-road is in contemplation, for which a survey has been made, and subscriptions entered into.'

So much, my Lords, with regard to the borough of Gateshead. I will not say more than one word as to the division of the county of Durham, as your Lordships must be aware, that that subject will come more strictly under the consideration of the House on a future day; but I must tell the noble Marquess, that I had nothing to do with the division of the counties. The division has been made by professional gentlemen of great credit, and whose characters were staked for the fairness and impartiality with which they discharged their duties, and for which they have made themselves responsible to Parliament. I can safely say for myself, and I believe every other noble Lord connected with his Majesty's Government can, on their parts, say the same—that I have not had the slightest communication with those Commissioners with regard to the division of Durham, or of any other county. But the fact is, that the division which has been made of the county of Durham is the only one which could, with fairness and propriety, be made. The rule by which the Commissioners have been governed, is precisely that which the interests of the country required. They have divided it into the northern and southern divisions; the former including the districts connected with the mining interests, and the latter including the agricultural districts. It would have been absolutely impossible to have made any other division, without mixing up the agricultural with the mining interests, against which I imagine much louder protestations would have been made. As to any individual who may possess property in the northern division being able to influence the elections, either of the boroughs or the county, my opinion is, that he could not have the slightest effect on the Representation. How is it possible that 2,000 or 3,000 independent householders could be influenced by any one or two persons who may happen to possess property in that county, so as to control the election of Members of Parliament? There may be a few persons, who, from their situations in life, or the nature of their tenure, dare not vote except as they are directed by their masters or landlords; these, however, can be but few, while the rest form a respectable and independent constituency, over whom no improper influence can possibly be exercised.

I trust that the effect of this Bill will be, to destroy all improper influence whatsoever. I mean not that proper and salutary influence which is derived from property and station, and the respect which attaches to the proper exercise of their duties; but I allude to that unconstitutional control which has been too often used under the existing system of Representation. I have no doubt that this Bill will do away much of that evil; indeed, I should be very sorry to be engaged in the formation of any Representative system, the provisions of which would not have that effect. With regard to myself, I can have no personal interest in the matter. As my lot is now cast in this House, I shall never have occasion to become a candidate, or to canvass for the votes which this measure will create, and I shall be well content to leave the merits of any friend of mine, who may wish to represent these places, to be freely decided on by its electors, without any interference on my part.

My Lords, I conclude by assuring you, that it is very painful to me, and must be equally irksome to your Lordships, to be obliged to occupy your valuable time in disclaiming any personal feeling in this matter, but the noble Lord has placed me in this predicament by making these charges. I cannot shrink from meeting them, and, in repelling them, I must repeat, that the motive which has actuated me in supporting this measure has been, not to promote the views or purposes of any party, but to render what I believe will be an inestimable benefit to my country; and I shall always consider the performance of that duty which was assigned to me in the consideration of this Bill, as the proudest act of my life.

The Marquess of *Londonderry* said, he never attributed motives to the noble Baron, but he could not refrain from stating, that the division of the county of Durham presented rather strange appearances.

Question agreed to, and Gateshead added to the schedule, as also Huddersfield and Kidderminster.

On the question that Kendal be added to the schedule,

Lord *Ellenborough* said, he must admit that Kendal was a thriving and respectable town, with a good manufacture, but he doubted much the propriety of depriving the only represented place in the county of Westmorland of its Members, in order to transfer the franchise to Kendal. He alluded to Appleby, the propriety of disfranchising which had been questioned more than once.

The *Lord Chancellor* would be ready to argue the question of Appleby whenever the question of schedule A, with which it was connected, came regularly before the House. With respect to Kendal, he could only observe, that it was a compact town, with more than 12,000 inhabitants, engaged in extensive manufactures.

Kendal added to the schedule, and also Rochdale.

On the question being put as to Salford,

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that there was much less reason for separating Salford from Manchester than there was for leaving Toxteth Park connected with Liverpool: while there were only 1,200 10*l.* houses in Salford, there were 3,300 10*l.* houses in Toxteth Park.

Lord *Suffield* contended that Salford was a perfectly distinct place from Manchester, and that it possessed interests altogether different and distinct from that town.

The *Lord Chancellor* also said, that Salford was entirely distinct from Manchester, and was under a different municipal government, whereas Toxteth Park was a mere prolongation of Liverpool, and was as much a part of Liverpool as any part of Westminster was of Westminster.

Question agreed to.

South Shields, Tynemouth, and Wakefield were then ordered to stand part of schedule D.

On the question being put as to Wallsall.

Lord *Ellenborough* opposed its enfranchisement, on the ground that it was a district spread over a large space, and not a distinct town.

The Bishop of *Lichfield* contended, that on account of the wealth possessed by Walsall, and the peculiar interests existing there, it was entitled to the Representation.

Question agreed to.

Warrington was also placed in the schedule,

On the question that Whitby stand part of the schedule,

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that however unwilling he might be to resist the enfranchisement of a shipping town, he doubted the propriety of extending that privilege to Whitby. This, so far from being a flourishing, was a decaying town; in proof of which he need only adduce the fact, that no new buildings had been undertaken there for the last five years; and that, during the last ten years, the population had decreased from 11,700 to little more than 10,000.

The Earl of *Mulgrave* said, that from having resided all his life in the immediate vicinity of this place, he could state from his own knowledge, that no decrease had taken place except in the maritime part of the population, and he could assure the noble Lord, that within a very recent period a very handsome range of new houses had been erected.

Lord *Ellenborough* had been indebted for the facts he had stated exclusively to the returns upon which the Bill was professedly founded.

Question agreed to.

Whitehaven and Merthyr Tydvil were severally placed in the schedule, and the clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On the ninth clause, which provides for the settlement of the boundaries of certain places in Wales,

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that it seemed impossible for the House to consider the boundary question, until the bill came from the other House, and he would recommend that the whole matter should be referred to a Committee up-stairs: it was of the deepest importance to the future operation of the Bill.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that when the Boundary Bill reached that House, their Lordships would have the experience of the other House to guide them. The remark of the noble Baron was, however, entitled to attention, though there was much greater difficulty in discussing the details of such a bill in the other House than in this. It might be a matter of future consideration; in the mean time, there was no difficulty in disposing of all the present arrangements, which were only provisional.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 12, that there shall be six Knights of the Shire for Yorkshire,

Lord *Wharncliffe* inquired why York should be the place of election for the North Riding? Northallerton would be more convenient.

The *Lord Chancellor* admitted, that Northallerton would be a more convenient place. York was retained, he supposed, because it was the customary place, and, *ceteris paribus*, would be the best; but its position rendered it inconvenient as a place of election for the North Riding. There was one circumstance in its favour—that there were all the appurtenances of courts there, and not at Northallerton.

Lord *Ellenborough* would then propose that a clause be inserted, giving six Members to the county of Lancaster, which had a claim to this distinction, in respect to population little inferior, and greatly superior in respect of wealth, to the county of York. From the manner in which it was intended to divide the county, it was evident, that the manufacturing interests would return the whole of the four Members proposed to be given to it, to the utter extinction of the landed interest from all share of the Representation. He had formed this clause upon the exact model of that relating to Yorkshire.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that this clause would render it necessary to disfranchise some boroughs, to get room for these Members. At least, if it were carried, some places they had determined to enfranchise must be omitted. It was, besides, unnecessary for the purpose the noble Lord had in view, of securing to the landed interest a share of the Representation. A large proportion of agricultural voters had been carved out from the counties for boroughs. As the Bill now stood, the members for Lancashire would be more agricultural than at present. This was, however, not the proper time to consider this question, but when they came to divide the counties with reference to Representation.

The Marquess of *Salisbury* wished to know, if he was to understand that the voters for the new towns and districts were not to have votes for the county?

The *Lord Chancellor* replied, that the arrangement then was, that if any man voted for the district, he was not, on account of the same property, to vote also for the county. This would not take all the town voters out of the county election, but it would take many.

Lord *Wharncliffe* announced his intention to move, at the proper time, that all the freeholders in towns returning Members be excluded from the county elections.

The Marquess of *Lansdowne* said, that by enfranchising the great towns in Lancashire, they would have rendered the county franchise more purely agricultural than before.

Lord *Ellenborough* admitted the truth of this, but the whole southern part of Lancashire was one great town, and, indeed, the Boundary Commissioners admitted, that they found on this very account the greatest difficulty in ascertaining where one ended and another began. There would practically, under this Bill, be no Representation of the agricultural part of the county.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that this must wholly depend upon the manner of dividing the county. It might be possible so to divide it as to secure two Members to the agricultural interest.

Lord *Ellenborough* contended, that any such division of the county must secure a preponderance to the manufacturing interest in the election of all the four Members.

Lord *Wynford* said, that the wealth and importance of the landed interest of Lancashire fully entitled it to two Representatives. When they came to the clause respecting the town voters exercising their franchise at the county elections, he should be prepared to show, that if it were intended to protect the landed interest, there never was a clause in any Act of Parliament more skilfully contrived to defeat its own purpose. It, in fact, let in every town freeholder to the county elections.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, Lancaster might be so divided as to give one large district almost purely agricultural.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that such an arrangement, if it could be now secured, would please him better than the success of his Amendment. Otherwise, he must press the Amendment. He would withdraw the Amendment, upon condition that they now determined upon a division of the county, in the manner suggested by the noble and learned Lord. He did not see why they should not fix the mode of dividing the county of Lancaster, as they had done in the case of York, and were about to do in that of Lincoln. If this proposition were not acceded to, he would take the sense of the House upon his Amendment.

The Marquess of *Salisbury* said, that as the division of counties was the question before the House, he could see no objection to going at once into the subject which the Committee were then discussing.

Earl *Grey* declared he did not anticipate such a result as that which had been alluded to by the noble Lords opposite. He did not believe, that the effect of this clause would be to exclude a fair share of Representation for the agricultural interests. The county of Lancaster had almost always returned Members connected with agricultural interests. He was surprised at the opposition thus offered, because, on a previous occasion, it had been asserted that, by adopting the course proposed by this Amendment, too great an influence would be given to the manufacturing interest. He saw no reason for acceding to the Amendment.

Lord *Wharncliffe* declared, that he should object to the divisions proposed, unless they were advantageous to the agricultural interest; but the county of Lancaster would have no agricultural Members. Of the present Members, he would observe, one was the son of a Peer living in the heart of the county, and another was a banker of Manchester.

The House divided on the Amendment:—Contents 15; Not Contents 70—Majority 55.

List of the NOT-CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Sussex.

DUKES.

Bedford
Devonshire
Norfolk
Richmond
Somerset
St. Alban's.

MARQUESSES.

Lansdown
Queensberry
Westminster.

EARLS.

Albemarle
Amherst
Charlemont
Chichester
Craven
Gosford
Grey
Hillsborough (Marquess of Downshire)
Huntingdon
Lichfield
Minto
Mulgrave
Onslow
Pomfret
Radnor
Suffolk.

VISCOUNTS.

Goderich
Hood
Lake
Leinster (D. of Leinster.)

LORDS.

Amesbury
Auckland
Audley
Brougham
Clements (E. of Leitrim)
Crewe
Dinorben
Dover
Dunalley
Dundas
Durham
Fife (Earl of Fife)
Fingall (E. of Fingall)
Fisherwick (Marquess of Donegall)
Glenlyon
Godolphin
Gower
Granard (E. of Granard)
Holland
Howard de Walden
Lilford
Lynedoch
Melbourne (Visc. Melbourne)
Monteagle (Marq. of Sligo)
Mostyn
Panmure
Poltimore
Ponsonby (Earl of Bessborough)
Ponsonby of Imokilly
Seagrave
Sefton (Earl of Sefton)
Sherborne
Stafford
Suffield
Sundridge (Duke of Argyll)
Templemore
Vernon
Yarborough.

BISHOPS.

Chichester
Hereford.

List of the CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Cumberland.

DUKE.

Beaufort.

MARQUESSES.

Bute
Salisbury.

EARLS.

Aylesford
Bathurst
Dartmouth.

LORDS.

Bexley
Bolton
Ellenborough
Kenyon
Penshurst (V. Strangford)
Stuart de Rothesay
Wharncliffe
Wynford.

Clause 14, that certain counties shall be divided, and return two Knights for each division, with schedule F, agreed to.

Clause 15, that there shall be three Knights of the Shire for certain counties, enumerated in schedule F 2, was put.

The Marquess of *Salisbury* moved, that the number be four instead of three; negatived; clause agreed to.

Clause 16 was agreed to.

Clause 17, that towns, which are counties of themselves, be included in adjoining counties for county elections, was then put.

Lord *Ellenborough* contended, that the holders of freeholds in these towns should vote for the town, and not for the county. He begged to know on what principle the noble Lords now proceeded?

Lord *Durham* observed, that the freeholders of Canterbury, Poole, and Southampton, had of old enjoyed a right of voting for the county. Therefore, there was no innovation in the principle introduced.

Lord *Wynford* denied, that the freeholders of Poole had a right to vote for Dorsetshire.

The *Lord Chancellor* stated, he had understood that they had.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 18 being put, which enacts

that no freehold for life shall give a vote for a county, unless it be worth 10*l.* a-year, excepting present 40*s.* freeholders during life,

The Marquess of *Salisbury* observed, that the object of the clause was, to give a right to vote for counties to persons who had no property in the county for which they voted, and towards the burthens of which they contributed nothing. He begged to ask the noble Earl, and he hoped that, as was usual with the head of the King's Government, he would have the courtesy to give him an answer, on what ground he proposed to take away the franchise of the 40*s.* freeholders for life?

Earl *Grey*, My answer is, the rights of freeholders are preserved for their lives.

The Marquess of *Salisbury* asked, what became of the rights of freeholders which were for three lives, and whether such property was not materially deteriorated?

The *Lord Chancellor* would explain the clause to the noble Marquis. If the freehold was for his own life, it was preserved to the existing freeholder; if it was for the lives of other persons, he retained the right to vote during his own life, exactly as if the Bill had never passed. The object of the clause was, to prevent the manufacturing of votes.

Lord *Ellenborough* thought the clause should have been differently worded. In his neighbourhood, common fields had been divided into freeholds of 2*l.*, 3*l.*, and 4*l.*, a-year. The population was very industrious and parsimonious, and desirous of possessing freeholds. In one parish there were 1,600 persons, and 100 freeholds of this description, every one of the holders of which would find that his son was disfranchised. A great portion of that part of the country was in the same circumstances. He entreated that the subject might be reconsidered.

Lord *Wharncliffe* understood the object of the proviso to be, the disqualification of what were called annuity 40*s.* voters, at the same time, that it was intended to preserve the rights of *bona fide* 40*s.* freeholders; but he apprehended the clause was so worded as to disqualify a great number of *bona fide* voters; and that he considered extremely objectionable.

The Duke of *Richmond* felt great satisfaction at the virtuous indignation expressed by noble Lords opposite, at the idea of disfranchising the 40*s.* freeholders. He could have wished, however, that they had not united in disfranchising 250,000 Irish 40*s.* freeholders in 1829. But, be that as it might, he congratulated noble Lords on having at last come to their senses, even at the expense of a sacrifice of political consistency.

The Marquess of *Londonderry*: What the noble Duke refers to was done to accomplish a great object, in the necessity of which almost every body agreed, but what was the country to gain by this measure?

Lord *Ellenborough* said, there was a great difference between the Irish and English 40*s.* freeholders, the latter being a much more respectable class than the former.

Lord *Holland* had voted for the disfranchisement of the Irish 40*s.* freeholders, but it was with the utmost reluctance—his vote had been wrung from him by an ardent desire to pass the great measure by which the disfranchisement was accompanied. He was sure the object of this clause was, not to disqualify *bonâ fide* voters, but the contrary: and, if there seemed any doubt on the subject, he, for one, should have no objection to introduce some words by way of amendment, which should set the matter at rest.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, it might be well to add one or two words to the proviso, in order to remove all doubt, and render it clear that no *bonâ fide* voter was to be affected by the clause. He had no objection to postpone the clause for the purpose of adding such words. Meanwhile, their Lordships could proceed with the next clause if they were disposed to go further to-night.

Lord *Wynford* also wished to exclude fictitious votes, but that could be easily done without affecting *bonâ fide* freeholders.

Clause postponed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, May 23, 1832.

Minutes.] Papers ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Ruthven, Account of the Salaries and Emoluments of Curates in Ireland.

Petitions presented. By Sir William Folkes, from Diss (Norfolk);—by Sir Hedworth Williamson, from Gateshead;—by Lord Ebrington, from Reading, Plymouth, Devonport, Totness, Ashburton, Leith, Paisley, and Dudley;—by Colonel Cavendish, from Derby;—by Mr. Heywood, from Manchester, Warrington, Rochdale, Oldham, Royton, Heywood, and from Ware;—by Lord Cavendish, from Belper and Bakewell;—by Mr. William Williams, from Abergavenny, and West-Monmouth;—by Mr. O'Connell, from the Political Unions of Birmingham, Bristol, and Kidderminster;—by Sir Ronald Ferguson, from Haddington;—by Mr. Horatio Ross, from Montrose, Duffield, Milford, and Holbrook;—by Mr. Wilbraham, from Hyde;

—by Mr. Denison, from St. Mary (Newington), Camberwell, Lambeth, and Christ Church (Surrey);—by Mr. Hawkins, from Tavistock;—and by Mr. Strickland, from Sheffield, and three other Places,—for Stopping the Supplies till the Reform Bill be passed.—By Sir George Murray, from Perth;—by Mr. Andrew Johnstone, from the Presbytery of Hamilton;—and by Mr. James E. Gordon, from Brighton, and thirteen other Places in England,—against the Ministerial Plan of Education (Ireland).—By Lord Cavendish, from Derby;—by Mr. Horatio Ross, from Aberbrothock;—and by Mr. Strickland, from Halifax,—in favour of the Factories Regulation Bill.—By Mr. O'Connell, from Kilbreedy, Athanasius, and Eurly-Greemon, against Tithes (Ireland); and from Glasgow, in favour of a Grant to Maynooth College.—By Mr. Horatio Ross, from Aberbrothock, for Parliamentary Reform (Scotland), and from the same Place, for Simplifying the Mode of Conveyancing in Scotland.—By Mr. Strickland, from Hemel Hempstead, against Negro Slavery.—By Mr. Leader, from Galway, for Equalizing Civil Rights in Galway.—By Sir William Folkes, from Free-bridge Marshland (Norfolk), for the Repeal of the Fire Insurance Duty.

REFORM OF PARLIAMENT (IRELAND)—PETITIONS.] Mr. *Leader* presented sixteen Petitions from several parishes in the county of Kilkenny, in favour of the Irish Reform Bill. Amongst them were those of Thomastown, Callan, St. Patrick's, St. John's, St. Mary's, St. Canice, in the city of Kilkenny, Freshford, Kilmana, Urlingford, Durrow, Killaloe, Graig, and from Kinsale, in the county Cork. There was also a Petition from the citizens of Kilkenny, praying for an additional Member, which, the hon. Member said, Kilkenny richly deserved, whether as regarded its trade or population, or its contribution towards the revenue of the kingdom. The latter had advanced from 12,000*l.* to 47,000*l.* per annum. Under these circumstances, he thought it most unfair that, while Galway, Limerick, and Belfast were to get additional Representatives under the Reform Bill, Kilkenny was to be excluded from the same privileges. Further, he would ask, upon what ground it was proposed to give the College of Dublin an additional Representative, which contained a constituency of about fifty or sixty persons, while the city of Kilkenny, with a population of 25,000 souls, and the seat of commerce and manufacture, was to be passed by unnoticed in the new plan for extending the popular Representation.

Mr. *Lefroy* was not surprised that the learned member for Kilkenny should feel indignant at the treatment which the city he represented had received at the hands of the projector of this new measure of Reform; but although he admitted his right to complain of this circumstance, he must say, that he conceived it most unfair of that hon. Member to disparage the claims of another constituency. The University could not boast of 25,000 inhabitants, but it could boast of this (and it was the ground upon which it rested its claim to an additional Representative), that it was the seat of learning and of education for Ireland. These were the claims of the University to the privilege which the hon. Member had thought fit to disparage, for what reason he was quite at a loss to tell. He (Mr. Lefroy) was quite aware that this was not the time to enter on the discussion of this question; but when the time had arrived, he trusted he should be able to satisfy the House, that the objections of the hon. Member were not such as should be entertained.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the University of Dublin boasted, that it was the only University in Ireland, but he might with great safety say, that it was the only thing it had to boast of—a more stupid University did not exist in any country. It had not produced a single work the name of which was worth recollecting; nor had it performed a single act of public utility that could entitle it to respect or consequence. On the contrary, it was the nursery of faction, and, in place of diffusing useful information and morality, some of its teachers were employed in performing the parts of political partizans, encouraging faction and bigotry, and poisoning every circle of social intercourse, by setting man against man, and producing religious animosities amongst all classes of the people. And this University had 100,000 acres of arable land, and 40,000*l.* a-year—although its constituency amounted only to ninety-six, it had the privilege of sending a Member to that House; and as he had touched on that point, he felt it his duty to state, that a more corrupt or shocking scene of perjury never was witnessed at any Irish election than at this very University of Dublin—this seat of learning, as the hon. and learned Member had thought proper to designate it. He (Mr. O'Connell) could not believe, until he had read the Irish Reform Bill, that it was intended to commit so monstrous a crime against the people of Ireland, as to give one, out of the paltry number of five additional Members, to this worthless nest of faction, corruption, and stupidity. He would not, upon that occasion, say anything more upon the subject, but he hoped, if there was a spark of feeling or sympathy in that House for Ireland, and unless the professions of hon. Members were mere lip-service, that this monstrous and iniquitous proposition would be scouted with the contempt it merited.

Mr. *Henry Grattan,* supported the observations of the hon. member for Kerry. The scenes which took place at elections in the University of Dublin were most disgraceful; and instead of a seat of learning, it would have been much more appropriate to call it the seat of party spirit, faction, and corruption. The hon. Member had stated that no work of consequence had been produced by the University. He, however, begged to remind the hon. Member, that a very celebrated work had been written on tithes by a learned member of that University, and in order to mark the sense of gratitude entertained by the University for this splendid effort of literary merit, the author was elevated to the office of Provost. The worth and talents, indeed, of individuals such as Dr. Sadlier and the Reverend Mr. Sandes, were almost calculated to redeem the character of the University from public odium, and these would live at least as long in public estimation as that of the hon. Gentleman who represented the University. It was, however, to be lamented that such men as those were exceptions to the general rule.

Mr. *Shaw* defended the University of Dublin from the aspersions of the hon. member for Kerry. He denied that no work of merit had been produced by the College of Dublin, and in proof of the truth of his remark, he adduced the works of the late Archbishop of Dublin, of Dr. Elrington, and others. The reason why they had not produced as many works as other Universities arose fron the fact, that the time of the members was almost wholly occupied in the education of youth.

Petition to lie on the Table and be printed.

CORPORATION OF CORK.] Mr. *Callaghan* presented a Petition from the city of Cork, praying for an alteration in the mode of appointing Civic Officers in that city. The petition was very numerously signed, and by some of the most influential gentlemen of that city. It stated that, notwithstanding the Catholic Relief Bill, the Corporation of Cork had, by their own regulations, prevented the operation of that measure in the manner in which Parliament had intended, and that Catholics were, with few exceptions, not admitted into the Corporation, though paying local burthens, and doing their share of the duties of good citizens. They stated that the Corporation had been perpetuating in Protestants the right of appointing Sheriffs and Juries, and that this was often exercised in a manner very offensive to them, and injurious to the public welfare; and they prayed that in future another and a better mode of appointing officers in authority over them should be adopted—a result which he trusted would, before long, be obtained by some beneficial measure to be introduced by his Majesty's Government, to whose attention, seeing the right hon. Secretary for Ireland in his place, he particularly recommended the petition. He begged leave to add, that it was agreed to at a public meeting, and contained the sentiments of almost all those of his constituents who at present gloried in being Reformers and correctors of all abuses; at the same time, he would not deceive the House by any statement that it conveyed the sentiments of the Corporation themselves, or of those who thought the Corporation useful.

Mr. *O'Connell* supported the prayer of the petition, as well upon the grounds stated by his hon. friend, the member for Cork, as that he had been requested to do so by many of the respectable persons who had signed the petition, and with whom he had the pleasure of being acquainted. There was no where to be found a closer or more bigotted Corporation than that of the city of Cork, which elected the magistracy of that place, and which, through its various ramifications and agencies levied taxes to the amount of more than 70,000*l.* a-year upon the citizens. This fact he was prepared to prove, and concluded by stating, that the prayer of the petition was entitled to the prompt attention of the Legislature.

Mr. *James Grattan* said, that the same observation would apply to the state of the Dublin Corporation, and he hoped soon to see an end to this abuse.

Petition to be printed.

SOAP DUTIES.] Mr. *Callaghan* presented a Petition from the Manufacturers of Soap at Cork, which expressed very clearly the grievance of which they had a just right to complain, and praying for an alteration in the law which gave to the manufacturer in England an undue drawback, by which the petitioners were driven out of the trade. He stated that the returns on the Table of that House shewed, that for the last three years the export of soap from England to Ireland was enormous, and that it was every year increasing. By that export the manufacturer in Ireland had been driven wholly to abandon his trade. The House would bear in mind, that as no duty existed on soap in Ireland, English soap, going to that country was, justly entitled in principle to a drawback equal to the duty paid in England; but the petitioners believed, that not only was this duty in England imperfectly collected and evaded, though the drawback was certain, that abuses existed which could be proved, and were known to the Excise, and he was enabled to state, that the Government, yielding to the entreaties of his constituents, had sent down to Liverpool one of the Commissioners of Excise, whose report he had read, and it admitted, that a certain allowance of ten per cent in the duty, in lieu of waste, was an abuse—that, in practice, the manufacturer who made soap for export sent it off before it wasted anything whatever, and it recommended that this allowance should be abolished. Notwithstanding this, however, nothing was done by Ministers to remedy this part of the abuse. He quite concurred in the statements on this subject made to the House by the hon. Alderman (the member for London), who had repeatedly addressed the House on the same subject, from information derived from the most intelligent manufacturers in the city of London, who were anxious, and had petitioned the House, for an alteration such as his constituents prayed for. He would assure the House, and especially the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, whose duty he hoped it would be to see that this oppression should not be continued, that he could not more effectually stop much of the growing disaffection that was pervading the mercantile community of Ireland, than by attention to this subject. He could assure the right hon. Gent. that he was personally acquainted with most of those who signed the petition—that they were loyal and respectable; but that many of them felt they were the victims of what he would call English injustice and knavery. Since this unjust drawback had annihilated their trade, they were become more zealous Repealers of the Union than influence, however powerful, or the example of other persons, however respected, could have made them.

Reform Petitions] The *Lord Advocate* presented a Petition from Edinburgh praying the House to take all constitutional means to ensure the success of the unmutilated Reform Bill. It had been agreed to at the largest public meeting ever held in that neighbourhood. The petition bore the signatures of 38,700 persons, the greater part of whom had affixed their places of abode or professions. He had been thus particular in stating this fact, on account of the extraordinary misstatements that had been made in the other House on the subject of these meetings. It had there been said, that one of these meetings did not consist of more than 700 or 800 persons—a statement so truly incredible, that he was surprised how any individual could be found so to impose on the credulity of the noble Earl who made the statement. Whether such a statement was to be made as to this meeting he was not aware; but from the information he had received from the hon. Baronet who presided, and from the gentleman who acted as secretary, he was prepared to refute any such statement by the fact, that a certain number of the meeting proceeded thither in procession, and were counted as they entered the area: these, alone, amounted to upwards of 10,000; and a military engineer, who was accustomed to such calculations, had measured the ground occupied by the meeting, and given it as his opinion, that its number could not be less than between 30,000 and 40,000. At all events the petition was signed by 38,700 persons in thirty-six hours. He was also further bound to add, that the meeting was characterized, from the begining to the end, by the most orderly and exemplary conduct; and he had been informed of the remarkable fact, that, on the day after the meeting, there was not at the police offices one single case of riot or disorder. He might also mention, that the day after the great Glasgow meeting, there was only one-fifth of the usual number of cases at the police-offices; both of which facts he would insist upon as a strong proof of the propriety of conduct observed by the people at these Reform meetings.

Mr. *Robert A. Dundas* did not rise to confute that which had been stated by the learned Lord, or to deny that there prevailed a strong feeling in favour of Reform in the city which he (Mr. Dundas) represented; but he wished he could agree with the learned Lord, that the most constitutional means were resorted to in getting up the meeting. He did not pretend to dispute about numbers, though he also had the authority of an engineer for saying, that, allowing four to one square yard, there could not have been more than 9,000 persons present. He was not authorized to mention this gentleman's name publicly, but should be quite ready to satisfy the learned Lord in private of the fact. This meeting, however, had proved one thing—that those who had hitherto been considered the supporters of Ministers in Scotland, had now allowed themselves to be united with that class of persons which, if the recommendation of the King's Speech had been followed by the Government, would have long ago been suppressed—he alluded to the Political Unions; and it was with the greatest regret he had heard that a gallant officer, who held a high commission in his Majesty's service, and who had recently received a mark of his Majesty's favour, in being appointed to the command of one of the most gallant regiments in the army—the ninety-second—had condescended to take part in the proceedings of the day, although, in various parts of the ground, there were displayed banners of a most revolutionary tendency, such as "put no trust in princes"—"the warning to Belshazzar," representing the King without his head; and flags declaring the glory of the revolution in France. He was convinced that, although every man in the regiment would cheerfully obey the orders which, in discharge of his duty, that gallant officer might give them, there was not a private among them, if he inherited the spirit of the country that gave him birth, but would gladly have torn down these banners on the spot. He could not but regard the conduct of persons who thus allied themselves with seditious meetings, to be highly deserving of reprobation. If they had not the courage to denounce such a meeting, at least they should abstain from taking part in its proceedings. One thing he would assert; it was not owing to the Political Unions, but to the good sense of the lower classes of Edinburgh, that the most atrocious acts of violence were not committed after the meeting was over.

Colonel *Evans* must say, that the course the hon. Member had taken, in thus attacking a private individual, might do much mischief to the gallant officer in question, but could do no good to the cause which the hon. Member meant to serve. If the meeting was legally convened, an officer in the army was not to be prevented, merely on account of his commission, from attending it; for he trusted that officers in the army were to be allowed to entertain political opinions on what side they thought proper. He, therefore, hoped that the hon. Member, or at least the House, would see the impropriety of the attack he had made, and would not think of holding the gallant officer responsible for all that was done by every individual in every distant corner of the field where the meeting assembled.

Mr. *Kennedy* said, he had never heard a more unwarrantable attack made. Because a person of high influence chose to put himself forward, and become, perhaps, thereby, the very means of preventing violence, the hon. Member thought himself justified in making one of the most injurious and most uncalled-for attacks he (Mr. Kennedy) ever heard in all his life. Considering the strong feeling that existed in Scotland, they ought rather to rejoice that it had found vent in the manner in which it had. He was the last man to excuse the violence of the placards; but still there was ground for congratulation that, under all the circumstances, a much stronger feeling had not been displayed. It was very easy to depreciate numbers on occasions like this, but he was prepared to maintain that the meeting was most numerously attended, and that, though no means were taken for procuring signatures, it received 38,000 names in two days. He might be told that it contained such signatures as those of Napoleon and Hadji Baba; but that only proved that those opposed to Reform had been mean enough to endeavour to cast obloquy on the petition in this paltry manner. All Scotland ought to rejoice that the strong feelings which prevailed had found a vent so peaceable as that of speeches at public meetings—that the crisis had passed away without more fatal consequences—and that the people had only struck terror into their enemies by the force of public opinion.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* wished the House to remember, that this meeting was called together in consequence of the King exercising his just prerogative, and not tamely obeying the immediate mandate of his Ministers. From the commencement of the Reform Bill he had been most anxious to see the question treated with fair deliberation; but from the beginning he had found the Government resisting that, and, on the other hand, doing all in its power to excite the feelings of the country. At his own election, because he professed his honest opinions, and refused to vote for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," there were persons, in conjunction with the Government, who took care to suppress anything like deliberation; and this had been the case at all other public meetings, whether the object was to petition Parliament, or to elect a Representative. They were now arrived at that stage at which the power of the King and the House of Lords was entirely superseded; under these circumstances he had made up his mind as to the Scotch Reform Bill. He considered it quite unnecessary to offer any suggestions respecting it, because it was well known that the Government would admit of no alterations. The Ministry was now not only invested with their own customary official power, but also with the power of the King and of both Houses of Parliament. It was, therefore, better to leave to them all the responsibility and inconvenience that must attend on a measure carried in so unconstitutional a manner.

The *Lord Advocate* knew that the greater part of the persons who attended the meeting were not in alliance with the Political Unions. As to the reference that had been made to the supposed misconduct of the gallant officer, he was prepared to contend, that the part he took was highly creditable to himself, and that it was monstrous to say, that he was to be responsible for the emblems displayed at the meeting. He would put it to the hon. member for Edinburgh, or to any man of common sense, whether a person on the hustings was to be answerable for individuals rearing fantastical or improper flags on the skirts of the meeting? Would the hon. Member have had the gallant officer vindicate his loyalty by making a violent attack on the banners of such an assembly? Why, surely that would have been the very way to have excited the feelings of the people, and to have given the signal for a breach of the peace. With respect to the emblems displayed, the worst he had heard of were, that the royal crown was encompassed with crape, and that, on one occasion, a portrait of the head of the King was reversed: but he had every reason to suppose that the gallant officer was equally ignorant with himself, at the time, of such emblems being exhibited.

Petition to be printed.

The *Lord Advocate* next rose to present a similar Petition from the town of Perth, which had been voted so late as the month of January last. The petition was signed by seven Peers, by all the Magistrates and persons of property in the county, and by 27,000 of the inhabitants.

Sir *George Murray* was not disposed to impugn the respectability of the petition, but, as it came from the county with which he was connected, he thought it necessary to say a few words on the subject. He could not deny that the petition certainly bore a great many respectable names; but he nevertheless felt himself fully justified in complaining of the very unfair grounds on which the petition had been got up. The intimation of calling the meeting began by what was not founded on fact. It commenced by stating the names of those who had signed a previous Reform petition; and it then intimated, that they were privately exerting themselves to obtain signatures to an Address to the King, and to a petition to Parliament, both of which were hostile to Reform. He denied the facts, and denounced the misstatement as a very unworthy and dishonourable artifice. He totally denied, that those who called the Perth meeting were justified in representing to the people that the former petitioners were enemies to Reform. The intimation was not consistent with truth, for those who had got up and signed the previous petition were not the enemies, but the friends of Reform, as the petition itself, now a record of that House, would fully prove. He begged those who entertained any doubt upon the subject to refer to the petition itself, and they would find that it set forth that "the petitioners would not withhold their acquiescence from such changes of the Representation as, from the lapse of time and alteration of circumstances, appeared to be necessary." He would now appeal to the House, whether it was consistent with truth to represent such persons as the enemies of Reform. But the advertisement calling the Perth meeting had affixed to it the names of many respectable persons, who never had given their sanction to their names being used for any such purpose. He would now come to the number of persons said to have been present at the meeting, and he would show that nothing could be more vague and unsatisfactory than the calculations made upon such subjects. One person of respectability had written to him stating that no more than 6,000 persons had been present, men, women, and children, and that had it not been a market-day, the numbers would not have been so great. Another person, a great promoter of the meeting, had written to him saying that there were 25,000 persons present, besides many who were attracted by curiosity. The vagueness of such estimates proved that very little reliance could be placed upon any of them. He was willing to give a very great latitude to the collection of signatures to petitions of this nature, but he nevertheless could not attach any very great degree of respect or importance to the signatures to the present petition, because in order to obtain them means utterly unjustifiable (such as threats of incendiarism) had been resorted to. Before he sat down, he must take the liberty of alluding to a calumny against the Scottish people, which that appeared a proper opportunity to notice, he alluded to a statement which appeared in *The Times* newspaper of the 27th of January last, which he held in his hand, and which was also inserted, in somewhat similar terms, in many other newspapers throughout the country. The statement in *The Times* was as follows. It purported to be a report of what was said by a noble and gallant friend of his, in presenting, in another place, a petition from the county of Perth, exactly similar to that which the learned Lord opposite had now presented to this House. 'Lord 'Lynedoch denied that any such language 'had been used at this meeting by the gen'tlemen in question. He had never heard 'of the circumstance before. As he was 'now on his legs, he would mention a fact 'which would show how strong the feeling 'in favour of Reform was in Perthshire. 'At the time their Lordships were discuss'ing the question, whether the Reform Bill 'should be read a second time, a great 'number of weavers assembled every day 'at Perth to see the south mail come in, 'and to learn the intelligence which it 'brought. After the news came down that 'the Bill was rejected, they stopped the 'mail to know whether there had been any 'disturbances in London. The guard re'plied in the affirmative, and said, that the 'Duke of Wellington and another illustri'ous individual had been shot by the mob. 'This intelligence, which ought to have ex'cited general disgust and indignation, was 'hailed with satisfaction by the assembled 'multitude, and in the vehemence of their 'indignation against the rejectors of the 'Reform Bill, they so far forgot the hu'manity of their natures as to go to a noble 'and gallant friend of his, and ask him 'whether they ought not to celebrate the 'fate of the Duke of Wellington and his 'colleague by a general illumination.' Now, he must say, that that statement was most calumnious. He, at least, could not credit, that any assembly of men could have so far forgotten the humanity of nature as to rejoice publicly in murder. No people in the world were less likely so to debase themselves than the people of Scotland, for there was not a more moral or humane people on the face of the earth. He believed, that the whole story was entirely without foundation, and for the honour of human nature he hoped that it was so. Either the nobleman in question had made a statement utterly devoid of truth, or the people of Scotland were entirely depraved, and had abandoned that character which for ages had belonged to them, and which he trusted ever would belong to them. When they could openly rejoice in an act of cruel and dastardly murder, perpetrated in the streets of London, and upon a man who of all men living had rendered the greatest and most important services to his country, they must indeed be sunk into the lowest depths of degradation. That noble person in whose assassination the people were said to have rejoiced, had not only rendered the most exalted services to his own country, but to the whole of Europe. It had been his good fortune to defend the independence of his country against her enemies—against a proud, unprincipled usurper, who had calumniated the people of England as a race insensible to glory, and incapable of deeds of arms, as one entire nation of shopkeepers. Yes, the Duke of Wellington had defended his countrymen against this charge and had raised the glory of the nation in arms higher than it had ever been raised at any previous period of her history. To that illustrious man, when he had completed his great exploits in war, was allotted the glory of redeeming the land of his birth from the stigma and ruin of religious intolerance. This was an act of equal, if not of greater importance, than all his achievements in the field. Let the country reflect upon such distinguished benefits, and then picture to itself the people of Scotland thirsting for his blood, and prepared to rejoice at the news of his death by murder. If it were possible that such a report could be correct—if it were possible that the people of Scotland were in such a state of excitement as thus to abandon all moral sentiment, and to discard every religious feeling—he should then say, that the petitions of such a people were of no value whatever. Whether the petitions of a people thus excited to depravity, thus lost to all humanity, were signed by 27,000 or 27,000,000 of names, he should say that they were utterly unworthy of the slightest attention.

Mr. *Haliburton* had not been aware, before he entered the House, that it was the intention of the learned Lord to present the petition from Perth; but, as he was present at that meeting, he would take the liberty of saying a few words about it. As far as he was able to judge (and his opinion had been confirmed by others), there were about 7,000 or 8,000 persons within hearing of the proceedings, and about as many more beyond earshot; so that the whole number of the meeting was about 15,000. He could say with satisfaction, that the meeting was both loyal and peaceable. He had moved the first resolution himself, which expressed attachment to the Throne.

Mr. *James Johnstone* was sure that the people of Scotland would never rejoice in assassination; but, in referring to the Duke of Wellington, that might be taken in a double sense; for, though they might have full respect for the Duke's military achievements, they might, at the same time, be glad that his political course—which, in Scotland, was deemed so mischievous—was at an end.

Colonel *Evans* had had the honour of serving under the Duke of Wellington, and would, therefore, say nothing against him. Indeed, on the contrary, he believed his Grace to be the first soldier of the world; but he (Colonel Evans) must nevertheless add, that it was with peculiar regret he had seen him bartering the well earned glories of military victory, for the doubtful honours of a political career.

Lord *William Lennox*, said, that though he differed from the Duke of Wellington's politics—though he rejoiced he did not come into office to pass the measure he had so often protested against—he could not sit silent and hear any palliation for the conduct of any individual who could rejoice in the supposed murder of that noble Duke. He felt assured that Scotland would not feel indebted to the hon. member for Dumfermline for palliating such a monstrous proposition.

Mr. *James Johnstone:* I beg to explain, that I meant no disrespect to the Duke of Wellington.

Petition to be printed.

PLACE OF HOLDING THE NORFOLK ASSIZES.] Mr. Baring presented a Petition from Thetford, against the removal of the Norfolk Assizes from that town.

Mr. Robert Grant presented a Petition from the county of Norfolk, in favour of the removal.

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* presented a petition from the north western portions of the county, against the removal, and four from other parts of the county to the same purpose. He had presented, a year ago, a petition for the same purpose signed by forty-eight Magistrates.

Mr. *Weyland* said, the general feeling of the county was in favour of the removal, and the petition just presented by the right hon. member for Norwich was signed, amongst others, by seventy or eighty Magistrates.

Mr. *Robert Grant* moved the second reading of the Bill for removing the Assizes for the county of Norfolk from the town of Thetford to the city of Norwich. The right hon. Gentleman explained that, by the Act of 11th Richard 2nd, it was ordered that the Assizes should be held in the county town, but that this having been found in some cases, inconvenient, it had subsequently, in the same reign, been directed that the Lord Chancellor and the Judges might direct the Assizes to be held in other towns. The latter Act did not, however, repeal the former; and subsequent statutes, particularly those for regulating the holding of Assizes in Cumberland and Cornwall, recognised its existence. In the county of Norfolk, the Assizes were held alternately at Norwich and Thetford; and the holding them at the latter place was found to be very inconvenient, because that town was situated at one extremity of the county, and the greater number of prisoners had to be brought from Norwich, which was a considerable distance from Thetford. Norwich was, in all respects, the most convenient place for holding the Assizes, and it was the wish of the great majority of the inhabitants that they should be held there. The expense of sending prisoners, attornies, and witnesses all the way to Thetford was very great. At Thetford, too, there was no accommodation for either Barristers, Judges, or prisoners, while at Norwich the accommodation was abundant. The necessity for passing the Bill arose from an application having been made to the Judges to remove the Assizes, who were unwilling to comply with the request. There was some doubts of their power, and a great dislike on their part to exercise it. The change was necessary for the due administration of justice, and a Bill was necessary to effect it, because there was no other certain means. He might be told, perhaps, to introduce a general measure, but he could not take such a task on himself; but there was a crying grievance which it was within his power, by the assistance of the House, to remedy. He, moved that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. *Baring* opposed the Motion. Thetford was a quiet town, much better adapted for the administration of justice than such a city as Norwich. He had heard nothing of complaints made by either the Judges or Barristers that Thetford was an improper place: but a conclusive argument against such a statement was to be found in the conduct of the Judges, who, having the power to order the removal, had not done so. There were notices on the paper for bills to remove other Assize towns, and he thought it would be better to bring forward some general measure, rather than to pass bills, Session after Session, for regulating the holding of the Assizes in every county of England. He thought no case had been made out for the interference of Parliament, and that the matter should be left in the hands of the Lord Chancellor and the Judges.

Mr. *Rigby Wason* supported the Motion. He did not question the motives of the Judges, but there were many causes which made those learned persons unwilling to interfere. The mere inspection of a map was sufficient to decide the question, but all doubts were removed by the fact, that in the centre of the county the population was most numerous, that Thetford was not only remote as to place, but was actually far removed from the mass of the population. It was more fitting that the Assizes should be held in a town which contained 70,000 people, than in one which did not contain 5,000.

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* opposed the Motion because it was improper to apply to Parliament. The power of remedying the inconveniences complained of was placed in the hands of the Judges, and if they had thought the removal not warranted, that House had no ground for interfering.

Mr. *Weyland* supported the Motion. He knew that the Magistrates had petitioned for the change, and he knew, too, that the present place of holding the Assizes was productive of great inconvenience and great expense. The gentlemen of the county were the best judges of what was desirable, and they were almost to a man in favour of the change.

Mr. *Petre* supported the Bill.

Lord *James Fitzroy* opposed it. He had heard no reason to justify so important a change.

Mr. *John Campbell* knew that the Bill was called for by the county at large, but as the Judges had the power of regulating the matter, it ought to be left to them.

Sir *James Scarlett* recommended the House, before proceeding, to ascertain whether the Judges had the power of removing the Assizes.

The *Attorney General* thought the measure desirable, and it was not the less proper because his right hon. friend had brought it forward to please his constituents.

The House divided on the Motion for the second reading:—Ayes 44; Noes 13—Majority 31.

Bill read a second time.

LIVERPOOL DISFRANCHISEMENT BILL.] Mr. Benett moved the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. *John Campbell* objected to the second reading, on the ground that the members for Liverpool were not present.

Mr. *Benett* could not consent to postpone the Motion on account of the absence of the members for Liverpool.

The House divided:—Ayes 44;—Noes 10;—Majority 34.

Bill read a second time.

Part of the AYES.

Barnard, Colonel
Barry, A.
Bentinck, Lord G.
Best, N.
Clayton, Colonel
Colborne, R.
Cole, Lord
Conolly, Colonel
Crampton, P. C.
Dick, Q.
Evans, Colonel
Forrester, Hon. C.
Grant, R.
Grattan, J.
Handley, W. F.
Hayes, Sir E.
Hoskin, K.
Leader, N. P.
Lennard, T.
Lennox, Lord G.
Lennox, Lord S.
Lennox, Lord W.
Miles, W.
Oxmantown, Lord
Peach, N.
Perceval, Colonel
Pringle, A.
Ponsonby, Hon. G.
Rice, S.
Rochford, Colonel
Ruthven, E. S.
Thicknesse, R.
Williams, A.
Weyland, J.

TELLERS.

Benett, J.
Wason, R.

List of the NOES.

Baldwin, C. B.
Bouverie, D. P.
Denman, Sir T.
Hodges, T. L.
James, W.
Parnell, Sir H.
Stephenson, H. F.
Wrightson, W. B.

TELLERS.

Campbell, J.
Warburton, H.

KING'S COUNTY ASSIZES.] Lord *Tullamore* rose to move the Second Reading of the Bill for removing the Assizes from Philipstown to Tullamore, in the King's County. The former town, his Lordship observed, was completely inconvenient, whether with regard to its position, for it was in the centre of the Bog of Allen, or as to its means of accommodation. The town was very small, and the Bar, Judges, and Jurors felt great inconvenience for the want of sufficient accommodation. A new Court-house had been recently erected in Tullamore, at considerable expense; and, independently of the reasons he had already assigned, which in themselves were sufficiently powerful, he thought that this was an additional argument in favour of the proposed Bill, for it would be most desirable that the Court-house and gaol should be as close as possible to each other, as very great inconvenience attended the removal of prisoners from one town to another. He moved that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. *Ponsonby* moved an Amendment, that the Bill be read that day six months, on the ground that the removal of the Assizes from Philipstown would be a severe injury to the inhabitants of that town.

Lord *Oxmantown* supported the original Motion, and for the reasons which had been stated by the noble Lord who introduced the Motion. That noble personage, he added, could not be supposed to be influenced by any personal motive in this transaction, for he possessed property in the vicinity of both towns, and he could have no object or interest in favouring one beyond the other. He was satisfied that the noble Lord was influenced by the most pure and praiseworthy motives—namely, a wish to facilitate the administration of justice.

Mr. *Crampton* supported the Amendment. He conceived that sufficient grounds had not been stated for changing the Assizes. There was another class of persons besides the Bar and Grand Jury, whose interests should be consulted—namely, the farmers of the county; besides, the building of a new Court-house would entail a very heavy expense on the county, and these were not times in which such burthens could be borne. It would appear that the new jail had been built with the view of affording an argument for the removal of the Assizes.

Mr. *Spring Rice* supported the original Motion, because he was of opinion that any measure which might be calculated to facilitate the administration of justice, should not be rejected merely on account of the expense of a new Court-house. He thought sufficient had been stated to induce the House to support this Bill, and he should accordingly vote for the second reading.

Mr. *Shaw* also supported the Motion.

Mr. *Ruthven*, from his geographical knowledge of the county, felt that the proposed measure would be a great benefit. Tullamore was eight miles distant from Philipstown, and it would be a monstrous inconvenience to bring persons such a distance for trial; besides, Philipstown did not afford sufficient accommodation. Individual interests should not be preferred to the public good.

Bill read a second time.

State of the Queen's County.] Sir *Henry Parnell* rose, pursuant to the notice previously given to make a Motion relative to the county he had the honour to represent. It was not his intention at that hour to occupy the attention of the House at greater length than was indispensably necessary for the discharge of the duty he had undertaken. To such hon. Members in that House as were connected with Ireland it must have been matter of notoriety that the Queen's County, to which the Motion he was about to submit to that House referred, was in a state of frightful disturbance—disturbance which, he regretted to say, so far from diminishing, was considerably on the increase. He was aware that his Majesty's Government had taken steps to repress these scenes of insubordination, and that a Commission had been sent down for the purpose of bringing to justice the perpetrators of the outrages which had disgraced that county. He trusted that this measure would have the desired effect, and that it might be the means of restoring peace and tranquillity. He felt, however, that this case was of such a serious character that he should not discharge his duty to his country and his constituents, if he did not persevere in bringing it under the immediate notice of that House—and in taking this course he was only acting in obedience to the wish of a numerous and respectable portion of his constituents, who had called upon him to do so. The Motion which it was his intention to make on this subject was, for a Select Committee to inquire into the general efficiency of the law in repressing disturbances of the nature he had described. Before he called upon the House to accede to his proposition, he felt bound to state what measures had been adopted by the local authorities to check the progress of crime in the Queen's County. In the first place—a meeting of thirty-seven Magistrates was held at Philipstown, to inquire into the state of the county, to investigate the proximate causes of those outrages, and to devise the most effectual remedy to arrest them. After much deliberation, it was determined at this meeting to form an armed association, in whose ranks all classes of the people were to be enrolled. Circular letters were despatched to the most remote parts of the county, announcing this resolution, and subsequently a meeting of the Central Committee of Magistrates was held, at which it was resolved to communicate with Government. In pursuance of this resolution, a communication was accordingly opened with the Government, and a supply of arms was requested for the armed association, of which he had before spoken. This demand, it was necessary he should state, was refused by the Government, on the alleged ground that the parties to whom the arms were intended to be supplied were exclusively Protestants. When this application had been refused, several other measures had been resorted to by the Magistrates of the county, and it was in consequence of the failure of all these measures that the Magistrates were compelled to adopt the present course, and to bring before the notice of the House the state of the Queen's County, with the view to remedy such defects as might be found in the existing law. In the observations which he had felt it his duty to make, he did not mean to impute blame to his Majesty's Government; on the contrary, he was convinced that they were actuated by the most sincere and anxious desire to put down these disturbances, and to promote peace and social order in the country. Such were also his motives in bringing forward his present Motion. He could not anticipate any opposition to this proceeding, because he was satisfied that every Gentleman in that House felt as great an anxiety as he could possibly feel, in rescuing the county from the foul disgrace which these outrages had unfortunately entailed on it. With these preliminary remarks, he would now move, that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the general efficiency of the law in Ireland for repressing outrages and disturbance.

Sir *Charles Coote* seconded the Motion. In doing so he was influenced by the double motive of obeying the wishes of his constituents, and doing that which was also in accordance with his own feelings and conviction. The speech of the hon. Baronet who had brought forward the Motion, had thrown such light upon the state of things in the county which he had the honour to represent, that little remained for him to add upon the subject. One thing, at all events, must be apparent to the House, from the statement of his hon. friend, that to whatever cause these disturbances were attributed, they did not arise from any indisposition on the part of the Magistrates to perform their duty. Every measure which the law authorized them to adopt had been resorted to—an armed association, to consist of all classes indiscriminately, had been proposed, but this plan failed—not from any want of energy on the part of the constituted authorities, but in consequence of the system of intimidation which was spread throughout the county, and which prevented the peasantry, who resided in thatched cabins, through fear of personal violence, from joining in this confederation, the avowed object of which was the preservation of social order, and the repression of those disturbances which had disgraced the county. He, like his hon. friend, could not anticipate any possible objection to the Motion. The state of the Queen's County was such as every Member of that House must deplore, and he felt convinced that they would all lend their sanction to any measure that might be calculated to remedy this appalling state of things—a state of things which, he was grieved to say, in place of mending, was daily becoming worse. Murders had been lately committed in that county in the most public manner, and several stands of arms had, within the last few days, been seized by the people. These were matters of too serious a character to be permitted to go on. Some strong and decisive steps were necessary, or it was impossible to say where it might end.

Mr. *Stanley* did not rise for the purpost of casting any imputation on the Magistrates of the Queen's County, and in any observations which he had to offer to the House, he should cautiously abstain from saying anything which might by possibility imply a disposition on his part to attach blame to their conduct—neither did he rise for the purpose of resisting the Motion of the right hon. Baronet. He had no objection to the Committee for which the right hon. Baronet had applied, if it would be likely to effect the object which it was intended to promote—namely, to correct any deficiency in the existing law; at the same time, he felt bound to state, that he was determined to oppose any extraordinary or unconstitutional measures, if any such were sought for by the present Motion. He had no doubt but the Magistrates had taken prompt, and what they considered efficient measures, to repress the disturbances in the Queen's County; but, notwithstanding this, he was also of opinion, that the existing law was sufficiently strong to put down all outrages: that it possessed a vigour which, if properly understood and exercised, could not fail to check the progress of this evil. He, however, saw no objection to the proposed Committee. On the contrary, he conceived that the investigation which was sought might be productive of the most useful and salutary results. For example, Gentlemen connected with other parts of Ireland—Clare, Galway, Roscommon, and other places, where disturbance existed—would have an opportunity of comparing the effects of the working and operation of the law in these various places—the extent and nature of these disturbances—the causes from which such effects had been produced—and the remedies which had been found most effectual in repressing these disorders. Nay, further, if after a patient investigation of these matters, the Committee should be of opinion that the ordinary laws required to be strengthened, then such additional alterations or amendments might be made as this House should deem consistent with the spirit of the Constitution; but he, for one, believed, as he had before stated, that the existing laws were sufficiently strong, if enforced with vigilance and vigour, and because he entertained this conviction, he could not resort to extraordinary measures at any time without extreme reluctance—because if once the system of resorting to these extraordinary measures were adopted, the powers supplied by the ordinary laws, which were sufficiently ample in themselves, would fall into disuse, and upon every slight occasion the Government would be called upon to interfere in such a way, as nothing but the most urgent and pressing necessity—in fact, which nothing but the total failure of every remedy afforded by the ordinary laws—could possibly justify them in acceding to. He therefore thought, that it would be most unfair to impute blame to the Irish Government for the part they had acted in the case referred to by the right hon. Baronet. In refusing the application made by the Magistrates of the Queen's County, the Government had been influenced by the soundest and most impartial views. They naturally felt that it would be exceedingly unwise and improper to place arms in the hands of any particular class in the community, and that such a proceeding, so far from being calculated to restore peace and tranquillity, or to repress crime, would, on the contrary, tend, in no small degree, to augment the disturbances of the county. Acting upon this principle, and on those views, the Government of Ireland felt that they were bound to refuse the application, and he should much regret that these acts, which were dictated by the purest motives on the part of the Government, should be made the subject of misconstruction and misrepresentation. He begged, however, not to be understood as casting any reflection on the hon. Baronet for the manner in which he had alluded to that circumstance—so far from this, he felt that the right hon. Gentleman had introduced the subject with much taste and delicacy. For the reasons he had already stated, he would not oppose this Motion, at the same time that he retained his opinion that the law, as it stood at present, was sufficiently strong and effective; but, under all the circumstances, he was not disposed to deny, that considerable benefit might result from the labours of this Committee.

Mr. *James Grattan* was of opinion that the object of the inquiry ought to be extended, and that it should be the duty of the Committee, not only to investigate the efficiency or non-efficiency of the law, but also to trace these disturbances to the fountain-head, and endeavour to ascertain the cause which produced effects so extraordinary and unnatural. He had but just returned from that part of the country which had been represented as in a state of disturbance, and, from experience derived from personal observation, he was enabled to state, that the laws were sufficiently strong as they at present stood, but why they failed in their efficiency he conceived was a subject of useful and interesting inquiry. He had received information about twelve months ago of the intention to form the armed association alluded to by the right hon. Baronet. Upon receiving the intelligence, he immediately went amongst his tenantry, and forty of them declared their willingness to bear arms for the preservation of the peace of the country, and to join this armed association. He immediately communicated this fact to the Magistrates, but from that day to the present he had never heard a word upon the subject. To prevail upon them now to join in such a plan would be a matter of impossibility, for he had within the last ten days made application to them, and they had to a man refused to bear arms, such was the state of intimidation which prevailed throughout the country. This state of things he thought was mainly attributable to the supineness of the magistracy, or at least to the injudicious system they had determined to adopt. In illustration of this, it was only necessary to remind the House of the fact he had already stated, that the services tendered by his tenantry had been rejected. Had the Magistrates, at the commencement of the disturbances accepted the assistance of the peaceable and well-disposed inhabitants of the country, the marauders would have been put down at once, and the peace of the country effectually secured. He did not rise for the purpose of opposing the appointment of the Committee; on the contrary, he thought that if the objects were extended, and the origin of this disturbance sifted to the bottom, much practical good would result from the labours of the Committee. He could not forget, that in 1825 or 1826 a similar inquiry took place before a Committee of that House, which had been productive of much good, and he entertained little doubt but that if this Committee were conducted with a similar spirit, it would be attended with equally beneficial results. It was monstrous to suppose that these outrages had resulted from any gratuitous love for mischief on the part of the people. There must be some pressing cause—some radical defect in the system, which required to be sifted to the bottom. It was on this account that he wished the inquiry of the Committee to be extended. If this humble suggestion were acceded to, he should support the Motion, but if it were not, he should feel it his duty to oppose it.

Mr. *O'Ferrall* said, that he should trouble the House with very few observations. He resided in a neighbouring county to that in which these disturbances had taken place, and from his proximity to the scenes of the outrages, and his constant residence in the country, he had an opportunity of watching their progress, and tracing them to their source. He quite agreed in opinion with his hon. friend, the member for Wicklow, that if proper steps had been taken in the commencement, before the disturbance had arrived at its present pitch, it might easily have been put down; but also fully concurred with his hon. friend in thinking that the people were not influenced in their conduct by any gratuitous love for mischief, but that there must be some primary cause, some radical defect in the system, which required to be investigated and amended. For these reasons he was anxious that the inquiry of the Committee should embrace all those points, for he conceived that it would be useless to attempt prescribing a remedy until they first perfectly understood the nature of the disease. And to understand it properly it was necessary that all the symptoms should be carefully examined, and accurately traced through their most remote ramifications. He had no doubt but if the inquiry was conducted on this principle much good would result from it, and he was perfectly satisfied that his view of this question would be fully sustained, and that it would be found, that these disturbances were, in a great measure, to be attributed to the conduct of the landlords; that, in fact, it was a war of property on the one hand, and the resistance of poverty on the other. If the suggestion of his hon. friend were complied with, and the inquiry extended to the consideration of these matters, the Motion should have his support; but, if otherwise, he should feel it his duty to oppose it.

Mr. *Leader* said, that he felt reluctant to differ from the right hon. Baronet, and the Secretary for Ireland, and the more so when several Gentlemen who represented counties which were contiguous to the Queen's County appeared desirous to support the Motion for a "Select Committee to inquire into the efficiency of the laws at present in force in Ireland." He admitted that it did not follow of necessity that there was to be a great change in the existing laws, because there was a Select Committee appointed to inquire into the efficiency of the laws at present in Ireland for the suppression of outrages against the public peace, but still he had been always apprehensive of seeing that done by the House which might lead to novel, and, perhaps, extraordinary proceedings. It was with him an invariable principle to enforce the old laws rigorously, rather than bring blame on the old laws to excuse the introduction of new laws possessing greater vigour and severity. He was not prepared for a very important Motion of this kind, and he was less prepared when it was brought on at one o'clock in the morning, and in a very thin House. He did not wish to interfere with the government of the country. He knew that, even in the county where the tithe disturbances commenced, there was a change for the better. He was mistaken if the Secretary for Ireland would not be disposed to admit, his official communications did not warrant the assertion that the state of the county of Kilkenny was not more tranquil than it had been [" *hear, hear!*"]. He presumed those cheers were for the purpose of denying the fact of any improvement. He thought the Gentlemen who entertained that opinion mistaken, as his information was, that, with the exception of the part of Kilkenny bordering on the Queen's County, the rest of it was very tranquil, compared with what it had been. Did Gentlemen forget, or were they entirely ignorant, that a special commission was, probably, at that moment, sitting in the Queen's County? Was not that county surrounded by a strong military force? Would it be denied that the same Government which sent special commissions into Limerick, Clare, and Galway, and tranquillized Clare, that was in a state little short of open insurrection, was not still responsible for the peace of Ireland? Would any man say, that Clare was not even a worse case than the Queen's County? Was there any Select Committee proposed, after the special commission to Clare, to inquire into the efficiency of the law at present in force in Ireland for the suppression of outrages against the public peace? He had no relish for Special Committees, at one in the morning for inquiring into the efficiency of the laws. He was afraid the Committee would be soon looking to the Insurrection Act, or some other strong coercive measures. He would be no party to Committees appointed in a moment of fever and exasperation. He would confide in the measures of Government which had been tried and had succeeded. It was painful to him to differ when so many appeared to agree. He did not think it was by more severe laws than those at present in existence, that disturbances were to be repressed. He looked for laws ameliorating the condition of the people, notoriously destitute and unemployed, as the only laws calculated to insure tranquillity and peace. He was happy to be in his place at that late hour to oppose the motion of the right hon. Baronet. He believed in his conscience that penal and severe laws only increased the mass of popular discontent, and if the remedial laws in progress for the improvement of the people did not tranquillize the country, he confessed he had very little expectation from any Special Committee for any such purpose as commencing an inquiry now into the efficiency of the laws at present in force for the suppression of outrages against the public peace. He was sorry to disturb what appeared to be the general sense of the House, but he expected from the desire he saw evinced by the Gentlemen on the other side for the Committee, that new laws were contemplated to be recommended, on the authority of the Committee, and he, therefore, entirely disapproved of the measure.

Mr. *Stanley* felt, that having already spoken on this question, he was not strictly regular in again addressing the House. He, however, begged their permission to make a few observations in reference to what had fallen from hon. Members who had lately spoken. The object of the motion of the right hon. Baronet was, to inquire into the efficiency or non-efficiency of the law; and it would extend to other districts than the Queen's County in which disturbance might exist. The right hon. Baronet had done him the honour of giving him intimation of his intention to bring forward the present Motion, and it was agreed between them, that the inquiry should be limited to the objects specified in the Motion. If they went beyond that, it would be attended with considerable inconvenience, and it would be impossible to define the duties of the Committee. With respect to what had fallen from the hon. member for Kilkenny, as to the efficacy of special commissions, he must observe, that it did not meet the motion of the right hon. Baronet. Special commissions, no doubt, had a most powerful influence in putting down disturbances, when they had arrived at an alarming extent; but measures of this description could not be brought to bear, until much mischief had been committed. For instance, a special commission could not be sent to any county until a number of prisoners had been taken; when this was the case, there was certainly less difficulty in procuring evidence, but the complaint of the right hon. Baronet was, that the powers afforded by the existing law were not strong enough to crush those disturbances in their bud, and before they had extended through the country. To this point the attention of the Committee ought to be confined; and he, for his own part, thought it would be productive of no public advantage, but, on the contrary, of much inconvenience, to extend the inquiry beyond this proposition.

Colonel *Perceval* considered the Irish Government to be highly blameable for their treatment of Captain Graham. He himself had been a Magistrate for twenty years, but in consequence of the scandalous treatment that gallant Officer had received, he felt that he should be dishonoured if he continued any longer in the Commission of the Peace; he also felt bound to say, after twenty years' experience as a Magistrate, that if he had been placed in the same situation as Captain Graham, he should have acted in a precisely similar manner. Now, with respect to the Queen's County, there was one fact which he thought it his duty to state to the House; two men had been capitally convicted for firing upon a Magistrate, a friend of his, and yet the Government, notwithstanding examples were necessary, from the disturbed state of the country, actually extended its clemency to these men, and commuted their sentence to transportation for life. Was this the way, he would ask, to quiet the country? For his own part, he felt convinced that, if strong measures were not resorted to, it would be impossible for any gentleman to live in the country.

Mr. *Spring Rice* was surprised at the remarks which had fallen from the gallant Colonel. He could not but deprecate such a line of conduct, upon a subject of such deep importance to the interests of the country. Violent observations were most unbecoming in discussing a question which required the most cool and dispassionate consideration. He implored of hon. Members to reflect upon the condition of the country, and he would ask them, if any possible good could result from indulging, at this period, in observations like those which had been made by the hon. Member who last addressed the House? He thought that much good would result from the intended Committee, and he, therefore, would support the motion of the right hon. Baronet.

Colonel *Connolly* said, he had that morning seen a letter from Mr. Greene, the stipendiary Magistrate, who had been lately appointed by the Lord Lieutenant for the county of Kilkenny. In that letter the county was described in a state of the most perfect tranquillity, but before he had concluded the letter, no less than seven murders were mentioned at the bottom of it. The inefficiency of the law in Ireland for repressing disturbances was notorious, and he, therefore, was determined to support the Motion.

Mr. *Shaw* complained of the tone in which the hon. member for Limerick had alluded to his hon. friend (Colonel Perceval). He thought that every Member in that House had a right to express his opinion upon the conduct of Government, and he must say, that he saw nothing in the observation of the hon. member for Sligo to warrant the lecture which the hon. member for Limerick had thought proper to read him. The hon. member for Kilkenny, he conceived, had been most infelicitous in his citation of that county as an example of proving the influence of the law in putting down these outrages. It was a well known fact, and admitted by the Irish government, that the law had been signally defeated in the county Kilkenny, and that his Majesty's Attorney General was actually obliged to postpone the prosecution of several persons, charged with the most atrocious crimes, from the system of intimidation which prevailed. He meant, certainly, to support the Motion.

Mr. *Ruthven* opposed the Motion. It was the conduct of the gentry which occasioned disturbances in Ireland, and as long as they held their present language, and pursued their present course of proceedings, Committees and severe laws would not repress disturbances.

Mr. *Walker* felt it necessary to oppose this Motion, from a conviction that its result and intention were, to obtain measures of increased severity against the people of Ireland. The wording of the Motion alarmed him, but after the violent speeches he had just heard from Gentlemen opposite, who supported this Motion, he was convinced that the Report of such a Committee would be to endeavour to obtain more coercive measures to goad the peasantry into rebellion. Had the Motion been what he first understood was intended, for a Committee to inquire into "the causes of the disturbances in the Queen's County," and other parts of Ireland, he should have voted for it, because he was convinced it would then appear that much of the disturbance could be traced to the oppressive conduct of the gentry and clergy—to the inactivity of Magistrates in some instances, the partial administration of the law in others, and unnecessary severity in more. He was firmly convinced, that the existing laws, if steadily and impartially administered, were quite sufficient to repress and punish outrage. It was not owing to a deficiency of severity in the laws in Ireland that the existence of outrage was to be attributed. It was to those persons solely who, by tyranny and oppression, sting their victims to madness, and by their partial and sectarian administration of severe and cruel enactments, drive them to despair; and then, instead of remedying those evils by retracing their steps, by acts of kindness or justice, they apply to Government for Insurrection Acts, and to Parliament for new powers to re-act the tyrant with impunity. He had acted for many years as a Magistrate; he had watched the causes which produced crime, and he had always seen the existing laws sufficient to repress it, and he could speak from experience, that those laws, when executed with mercy, impartiality, and steadiness, never failed in preserving peace, and, when so executed, were always respected by the people. He was perfectly astonished at the unnecessary reference which had been made to the occurrence at Newtownbarry, by the hon. member for Sligo, and the praises he had bestowed on Captain Graham, and the yeomanry, for their conduct on that occasion, and the attempt to throw blame on the people of the county of Wexford. It was impossible that he could suffer such remarks to pass without noticing them, as he could never look on that individual and his associates but as murderers [*"No, no"*]. Yes, yes—he could never look on their acts in any other light, His countrymen were accused of crime—the county he belonged to was represented as the theatre of sedition—but he would say, that the only serious crime which had occurred for years; the only murders which had been committed, were those committed on twenty innocent persons, who had been so unnecessarily shot at Newtownbarry; for, he would ask, what other name than murder could any unprejudiced person give to the indiscriminate slaughter of so many unresisting and flying people, by yeomen pretending to force an illegal sale and distress of cattle, seized for tithes actually not due, and yet to the sale of which no opposition was offered? He must oppose the Motion, feeling that the present laws were sufficiently strong and efficient, and should, certainly, resist the formation of any Committee, the result of which was likely to have the smallest tendency to increase the severities of the laws in Ireland.

Mr. *James Grattan* requested the right hon. Baronet to enlarge his Motion, so as to embrace an inquiry into the causes of disturbance in Ireland.

Sir *Henry Parnell* saw no advantage likely to result from it, and must, therefore, decline to accede to the request.

Sir *John M. Doyle* said, as the right hon. Baronet would not accede to the request of his hon. friend, he must, though unwilling to do so, divide the House on the Motion.

The House divided, but there being only twenty-two Members present, it necessarily adjourned.

END OF VOL. XII.—THIRD SERIES.

INDEXES

GENERAL INDEXES

TO

VOLUME IX, X, XI, AND XII *(THIRD SERIES)* SESSION 1831-2,

(Fourth Volume of the Session)

OF

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

(A.)—SUBJECTS OF DEBATES.

N° I. HOUSE OF LORDS.—N° II. HOUSE OF COMMONS.

N° I. DEBATES—LORDS.

ADDRESSES in answer to the King's Speech vol. ix. 1. Answers to, 127.
.... On the policy pursued towards Belgium, ix. 834
Agitation, causes of, in Ireland, x. 731
Agricultural Labourers (Bill), x. 1156.—xi. 126
Anatomical science, petitions concerning, ix. 132, 1148.—x. 1
Arbitration Bill, ix. 972, 1226
Arundel, Borough of, xii. 106

Belgic Negotiations, ix. 131, 228, 586, 834.—x. 11.—xi. 124, 302

Canton, British Factory at, ix. 207
Chancellor, Lord, of Ireland, x. 1040.—xi. 94
Cholera Morbus, Motion for papers, x. 248. Measures of precaution, 406, 442

Death, Sentence of (Bill), xi. 1274
Dublin Coal Trade (Bill), xi. 478, 582
Durham, University of, xii. 1209

Education (Ireland) Ministerial plan, x. 851.—xi. 89, 241, 1076. Resolution condemning it, 583.—Petitions, xii. 323, 496
Eldon, Earl of, x. 1268
Ellenborough, Lord, plan of Reform, xii. 1098
Emigration, ix. 1146
Explanations, xi. 1.—In relation to the change of Ministry, xii. 758, 905, 982, 993, 1043

Factories, Labour of Children in, Petitions, x. 985.—xi. 109
Fees on renewing Commissions, ix. 768.—x. 249
Foreign Enlistment Act, ix. 316
French Expedition to Italy, x. 725.—xi. 112

Gateshead, xii. 1375
Glove Trade, Petitions, x. 14, 682.—xi. 2. Motion to support a Committee, 2
Graham, Captain, xii. 499

Holland and Belgium, ix. 228, 586.—x. 11
Hundred Remedies (Bill), xi. 297

India, Affairs of, ix. 127.—Laws relating to Property, 585

Jamaica, x. 724
Juries (Ireland) Bill, xi. 1248

Lancashire, proposal to give it Six Members, xii. 1375
Law Process, x. 986. Improvements in the administration of, 1158

Magistracy, Irish, ix. 768.—x. 249
Ministerial arrangements, xii. 993, 1043
Ministers, resignation of, xii. 758. Re-appointment of, 982
Ministry, a new one, xii. 905

National Schools (London), x. 579
Navy Civil Departments, xii. 1369
Newtownbarry, affray at, xii. 499
Nozeed, Zemindar of, xi. 117, 300, 480

Parliamentary Reform, Petitions, ix. 207, 829.—x. 680.—xi. 1092, 1245.—xii. 211, 669, 760, 868. Bill for England, first reading, xi. 858.—xii. 1, 122, 213, 327. Committee, 676, 762, 1098, 1220, 1375

Pedro, Don, ix. 316

Peers, creation of, xii. 1096, 1218

Perth, Language held at, ix. 829

Pluralities Bill, x. 1107.—xi. 301, 315, 787, 931, 1166

Police, Municipal, ix. 973

Political Unions, ix. 133, 834

Ponsonby, Lord, Conduct of, x. 1104

Poor Laws, ix. 130, 1144.—x. 723

Portugal, Expedition against, ix. 316

Post Office Packets, x. 1157

Prosecutions (Ireland), xi. 125

Reciprocity Treaties, ix. 974, 1226

Russian-Dutch Loan, ix. 1152

Slave Trade, ix. 587.—Convention concerning, 772

Stockton-on-Tees, xii. 1094

Tithes (England), Petitions, xi. 786. (Ireland) Petitions, ix. 131, 822.—x. 2, 674, 844.—xii. 1366.—Committee to inquire into, ix. 229, 973.—x. 408, 445, 731, 1269.—xi. 125.—Arrears of (Bill), xii. 631, 745, 1363

Tonnage duties in France, xi. 479

Tower Hamlets, xii. 1220

West India Interest (Committee), xii. 596

Westmeath, Magistrates of, xi. 1293

Nº II. DEBATES—COMMONS.

Address in answer to the King's Speech, ix. 37. Answer thereto, 134. Report thereupon, 105.—For the King not to call to his Councils other than Reform Ministers, xii. 783. Answer to, 1144

Agricultural Implements, no remedy for the destruction of, x. 465

Alien Act, x. 764, 965

Anatomy, Schools of, Bill to regulate, ix. 300, 578, 702, 825.—x. 832.—xii. 309, 664, 894—Petitions, ix. 780, 1185, 1276.—x. 377

Appleby, Case of, ix. 648.—x. 592

Arms, learning the use of, xi. 1094

Army Estimates, x. 480.—xi. 1018, 1281.—Extraordinaries, x. 503

Assessed Taxes, intention of Ministers concerning, ix. 645.—x. 721

Bank Charter, ix. 37.—Appointment of the Committee to inquire into it, xii. 1356

Barristers, Payment of, x. 229. Responsibility of, 425.—xi. 84

Beer, Sale of, Act, ix. 1233.—xii. 733

Belgium, ix. 1268, 1282

Belmore, Earl of, xi. 329

Benefit Societies, x. 1063

Births, Registration of, x. 686

Botany Bay [*see* New South Wales.]

Boundaries Bill, read a first time, x. 417

Bowring, Dr., x. 472

Boyd, Mr., x. 635

Brazilian Claims, ix. 1274.—x. 895.—xii. 551

Bricks, duty on, ix. 649

Bristol, Riots at, discussed in the Motion on Address, ix. 37

British Museum, x. 975

Broadhurst, Mr., and others, xi. 944

Buckingham Palace, ix. 144, 574, 646.—x. 969.—xi. 955

Building, Public, Bill to consolidate offices of, ix. 147

Burkers, ix. 154

Business, arrangement of, ix. 126, 150.—x. 383, 1063.—xii. 84

Capital Punishments, Bill for abolishing, xi. 948

Catholic Marriages, xi. 1245.—xii. 1209

Chancellor, The Lord, (Ireland) x. 1206

Chancery, Costs in, ix. 251.—Contempt of the Court of, 649

Chelmsford, Representation of, x. 689

Children, Labour of, in Factories, Bill to regulate, ix. 255.—Petition, 1092 [*see* Factories]

Chinese, disputes with the, xi. 413

Cholera Morbus, motion for Papers, ix. 308.—xi. 295, 1017.—Precautions etc., x. 265, 324, 337, 384, 402, 437.—xi. 88.—Case of, 470. Questions, 532, 689. (Scotland), 1115

Christmas, Adjournment for, ix. 330

Civil List, x. 509

Coast Guard, xi. 330

Coleraine, Borough of, ix. 705

Colonial Appointments, x. 32

Combinations, illegal (Ireland), xi. 242

Commercial Treaties, ix. 227.—Policy, xii. 1277

Commissions, Special, ix. 1049

Commons, House of, Improvement in, x. 333

Communication with Ireland, xi. 1277

Cork, Corporation of, xii. 1401
Coroners (Bill) x. 416.—xii. 744
Corporation Reform (Ireland) ix. 1332
Counties, division of, x. 417
Courts Martial, x. 421
Curtin, Mr., Case of, xii. 545
Custom House Officers (Ireland) x. 24
Czapski, Count, x. 764, 965

Dartmouth, x. 693
Deccan Prize Money, ix. 155
Distress, Public, ix. 154
Dorsetshire Election, ix. 560.—xii. 1035
Drainage, General, ix. 1184
Dropped Orders, xi. 128.—xii. 84
Drummond, Lieutenant, calculations, x. 536
Dublin—Turnpike Roads, x. 382. St. George's Church, 415
Durham Gaol, xii. 303

East-India Affairs, Committee, ix. 1020
Education (Ireland) Ministerial System of, ix. 893.—Petitions on, x. 259, 1057, 1111, 1162. —xi. 320, 402, 1013, 1181.—xii. 80, 464, 537, 633, 735, 1135
Emigration, xi. 205
Estimates, why not laid on the Table, ix. 1097. Navy, x. 278. Army, 480. Civil Contingencies, 297
Exchequer, Court of, Scotland, Bill to regulate it, ix. 297, 1194.—xii. 201
Exports, returns, ix. 779

Factories, Labour of Children in,—Petitions, ix. 1092.—x. 20, 106, 190, 529, 894, 1222.—xi. 204.—Bill to regulate, ix. 255.—xi. 340
Fast, motion for a General, ix. 895
Fees, on renewing Commissions (Ireland), ix. 557.—x. 28, 33
Financial year, Date of, x. 272.—xi. 329
Fines and Recoveries, ix. 138, 701
Flogging in the Army, xi. 1188
Foreign Affairs, x. 635.—xi. 871
France, Commercial Treaty with, ix. 139.—xii. 464.—Convention (Slave Trade) with, ix. 810, 1351.—Treatment of British Subjects in, 1192
Freemen and their Daughters, Rights of, x. 45
French Expedition to Italy, x. 635, 1225.—xi. 129
Friendly Societies, ix. 156.—xi. 33, 293

Glass Duties, xi. 1280
Glove Trade, Petitions, ix. 253, 589.—Motion for a Committee, 1051.—xi. 1253
Government Officers, xii. 990
Gravesend Pier, xii. 193
Greece, Sovereign of, x. 635
Greenwich Hospital, x. 1311
Helston, x. 693, 1065
Hemp and Flax Duties, x. 468, 1306.—xi. 1178
Heriot's Charity (Scotland), xi. 1184
Hertford Address to the King, x. 199
Hill, Sir George, x. 527
Holland and Belgium, ix. 1268, 1282
Hutchinson, Mr., claims, xii. 195
Hypothec, Landlord's right of (Scotland) x. 188

Intestates, Property of, ix. 1028
Ireland, state of, xi. 490, 1157
Ireland [*see* Juries, Kilkenny Education, Magistracy, Tithes, Dublin, Subletting Act, Custom House Officers, Master of the Rolls, Seceding Ministers Combination, Westmeath, Registrar]

Jamaica, Insurrection at, x. 535.—xi. 329
Juries, Grand (Ireland), ix. 135.—x. 632, 1114

Kilkenny, Affray in, ix. 141
King's County (Ireland), place for holding the Assizes, xii. 1414
Knowledge, Taxes on, Petitions for the repeal of, ix. 102.—xi. 32

Lancaster Castle, Gaoler of, xi. 1278
Land-Revenue Department, compensation to offices of, ix. 152.—Bill, 574, 646
Leaf and Co., Case of, x. 585
Libels, Law concerning, xii. 1144
Lincolnshire, Division of, ix. 810.—Militia, x. 1324
Liverpool Disfranchisement (Bill), xii. 1414
London Bridge, x. 256
London, Improvements in the City of, xi. 242
Lovatt, Case of, x. 379
Lynedoch, Lord, xii. 1403

Madeira, xii. 464
Magistracy, Ireland, Fees on renewal of Commissions, ix. 793
Mails between England and Ireland, x. 684
Malt Drawbacks, x. 510, 977.—xi. 1095, 1165, 1185
Manchester Meeting (1832) x. 195.—xi. 944. Affray at, (1819) x. 196.—xi. 1251
Marshall, Mr., x. 472
Maynooth College, xii. 306
Mayo, Magistracy of, xi. 1269
Meilleraye, La, expulsion from, ix. 1192
Merthyr Tydvil, xi. 206
Metropolitan Districts, x. 908
Midhurst, x. 693
Military Establishment, ix. 143.—Punishment, x. 421

Militia, x. 379

Ministers, Resignation of, xii. 770, 783, 876, 905, 984. Resumption of Office, 1035, 1071

Ministry, formation of a new one, xii. 905

Municipal Police, x. 1233

Mutiny Bill, xi. 1188

National Gallery, xii. 466

Naval Establishment, ix. 143.—Navy Estimates, x. 278, 970.—xi. 330, 924.—Civil Departments' (Bill), 349, 765.—xi. 333

Navigation Laws, xii. 1277

New South Wales, x. 669

Newspapers, Tax on, ix. 221

New York, x. 969

Norfolk Assizes, place for holding, xi. 267.—(Bill), xii. 1411

Nottingham, Riots at, ix. 1049

Ordnance Estimates, x. 669

Palaces, xii. 466

Papers, stained, Duty on, x. 101

Parliamentary Reform, ix. 328, 708. Petitions concerning, 97, 214, 216.—xii. 781, 876, 1032, 1274, 1403.—Questions concerning, ix. 36, 257, 1197.—Explanations, 214, 1090.—Returns, 564.—Bill for England, first stage, 156.—Second reading, 343, 429.—Committee, 651, 720, 810, 980, 1100, 1203, 1234.—x. 45, 75, 217, 232, 393, 425, 536, 592, 693, 908, 1069, 1117, 1263.—xi. 43, 84.—Report, 84, 207.—Third reading, 414, 493, 650.—Final stage, 849.—Progress of, ix. 1197.—Bill for Ireland, first stage, 595.—Petitions, xii. 1398.—Bill for Scotland, first stage, ix. 632.—Second reading, xii. 1174.—Petitions, ix. 1232

Peers, creation of, xii. 1274

Penitentiary, xii. 466

Pensions (Soldiers'), Commutation of, xi. 1188, 1281

Perceval, Mr., Breach of Privilege in his case, ix. 1030

Petersfield, x. 592

Petitions, Presentation of, x. 383.—Committee to inquire into, xii. 781

Plunkett, Lord, x. 1206

Pluralities, xii. 754

Poland, xii. 636

Police, Municipal, ix. 143, 1097.—x. 1233

Polling places, x. 393

Political Unions, Petitions from, ix. 594, 1278

Poor, Allotment of Land Bill, xi 286

Poor Laws, Intention to amend, ix. 1097, 1233.—x. 27

Poor Laws (Ireland), Petition, ix. 709

Population Returns (Ireland) ix. 594

Portugal, Relations with, x. 108, 970

Postage of Letters (Ireland) ix. 1224

Post Office, ix. 221.—Post Office regulations, x. 684, 1232.—xi. 806, 1277.—xii. 304

Presbyterian Ministers (Ireland) x. 23

Press, conduct of the, xii. 1144

Privilege, Breach of, ix. 1030.—x. 527.—xii. 542, 741.—Questions of, ix. 1275.—From Arrest (Bill), x. 327

Professors of Oxford and Cambridge, xii. 466

Proxy, Voting by, xi. 1156

Queen's County (Ireland), state of, xi. 1157.—xii. 1416

Registrar of Deeds (Ireland) xi. 1272.—xii. 96

Registration, General, of Deeds, Bill for, ix. 125, 563.—x. 663, 1205.—Petitions concerning, 586, 976, 1186, 1227.—x. 53

Requests, Courts of, xii. 752

Revenue Laws, Breach of, ix. 297.—Deficiency in, 1285

Rolls, Master of, (Ireland) x. 637

Roman Catholic Marriages, xii. 1209

Russell, Gaoler of Huntingdon, xi. 492

Russian-Dutch Loan, questions concerning, ix. 333, 1284.—Motion for papers, 429.—For censuring Ministers, 903

Saint Saviour's Church, x. 527

Sartorius, Captain, x. 477.—xi. 412

Satirist, the, complaint against, xii. 1144

Schedule A, x. 536

Seamen's contribution to Greenwich, x. 1311

Seceding Ministers, x. 1112

Session, Court of (Scotland), Bill to prevent obstruction of business, ix. 808

Sheriff's power of appointing returning officers, ix. 810.—High office of, x. 325

Silk Trade, state of, ix. 647.—x. 580, 585.—xi. 296.—Appointment of Committee, x. 992.—xi. 285

Slavery, Petitions against, xi. 127

Slave Trade, Convention with France, ix. 810

Smuggling of Silk, ix. 139, 297

Soap Duty, x. 898.—xii. 1402

Spirits, Drawback on, ix. 138

Stamford, boundaries of, xi. 406

Stamp-Office Prosecutions, xi. 491

Stockton-on-Tees, x. 1117

Strangers excluded from the gallery, ix. 895

Subletting Act (Ireland) x. 570

Sugar Duties, x. 964, 1236.—xi. 63, 807

Sunderland Harbour, case of Privilege concerning, xii. 542, 741

Supplies, petitions to stop the, xii. 781, 876, 1032, 1274

Supply, ix. 153, 1285.—x. 272, 480, 669, 970.—xi. 330, 924, 1018, 1281.—xii. 466

Surrey Roads, xi. 34
Swan River Settlement, x. 503

Terceira, Government of, seizes British ships, x. 107
Timber Trade, x. 1232
Tithes in Ireland (Committee) ix. 259, 781, 1193.—x. 525, 1331.—Ministerial plan for regulating, xi. 134, 970, 1042, 1112, 1234, 1363.—xii. 85, 572.—Petitions, ix. 709, 781.—x. 20, 66, 102, 309, 410, 987, 1061.—xi. 243.—xii. 465, 633
Travancore, Rajah of, xii. 195
Troops, Employment of, x. 968
Vaudois, the, ix. 799
Vestries' Act, Amendment Bill, ix. 763.—x. 897
Utopia, case of, x. 895

Waterford, petition from, ix. 709
Ways and Means, x. 1236.—xi. 329
Wellington, Duke of, his conduct in undertaking to pass the Reform Bill, xii. 905
West Indies, relief for, x. 971, 1236.—xi. 34, 290, 807, 1016
Widows' Pensions, x. 480

Yorkshire, Division of, ix. 810

(B).—MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN IN DEBATE:—

I.—HOUSE OF LORDS.

Aberdeen, Earl of, ix. 25, 132, 228, 316, 322, 586, 778, 834, 888
—x. 11, 14, 725, 1055, 1302
—xi. 112, 123
Anglesey, Marquess of, xii. 514, 528
Armagh, Archbishop of, x. 870
—xi. 89, 1087
—xii. 745
Auckland, Lord, ix. 1226
—x. 18
—xi. 16, 478, 479, 582
—xii. 1369

Bangor, Bishop of, xi. 804
Bath and Wells, Bishop of, xi. 16, 128
Bathurst, Earl of, xi. 1245
—xii. 56
Beresford, Viscount, xi. 1305, 1308
Bexley, Lord, ix. 585, 586
—xii. 692, 1368
Bristol, Bishop of, xi. 632, 1176
—xii. 259, 325, 1071
Buccleugh, Duke of, xii. 673, 676, 870
Buckingham, Duke of, ix. 28, 36
—x. 457, 462, 723
—xii. 1, 3, 220, 301, 353, 367, 731, 1106
Bute, Marquess of, xi. 942

Caledon, Earl of, x. 763, 1302
—xi. 1
Camperdown, Earl of, ix. 5, 25
—xii. 674, 868, 871
Canterbury, Archbishop of, x. 985, 1299, 1303
—xi. 301, 315, 316, 318, 319, 787, 799, 804, 934, 938, 941, 943
—xii. 616
Carnarvon, Earl of, ix. 244, 1146, 1147
—x. 462, 464, 1157
—xi. 127, 1865
—xii. 369, 454, 718, 766, 768, 905, 1023, 1030, 1062, 1066, 1069, 1107, 1220, 1255, 1256, 1377
Chancellor, Lord, ix. 130, 133, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1166
—x. 100, 455, 723, 724, 762, 763, 1045, 1046, 1158
—xi. 109, 126, 486, 804, 1275
—xii. 408, 621, 630, 672, 676, 686, 760, 761, 874, 983, 1022, 1056, 1058, 1098, 1115, 1131, 1133, 1250, 1254, 1256, 1268, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1377, 1386, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1396, 1397, 1398
Chester, Bishop of, xi. 310, 804, 941
Chichester, Bishop of, x. 740
—xi. 615, 1085
Clanricarde, Marquess of, ix. 239
—x. 256, 463, 680
—xi. 22, 95, 109, 594, 620
—xii. 529, 1029
Cleveland, Marquess of, xii. 103, 118, 1094, 1095, 1096
Clifden, Viscount, x. 257
Clifford, Lord, xii. 723
Cloncurry, Lord, ix. 131
—x. 7, 256, 676, 891
—xi. 125, 241
—xii. 532
Colville, Lord, xii. 146, 1374
Coventry, Earl of, ix. 207
—xi. 2
Cumberland, Duke of, xii. 1219, 1271
Darnley, Earl, xii. 1130

David's, St., Bishop of, xii. 1217
Delawarr, Earl of, xii. 1030
Dover, Lord, x. 1056
—xii. 768
Durham, Bishop of, xi. 798, 1172
—xii. 48, 1209, 1214
Durham, Lord, xii. 351, 353, 369, 1128, 1132, 1211, 1217, 1223, 1261, 1380, 1386, 1396

Eldon, Earl of, ix. 24, 832, 1151, 1180
—x. 677, 737, 755, 1107, 1268, 1298
—xi. 91, 301, 316
—xii. 390, 532, 533, 672, 673, 1097
Ellenborough, Lord, ix. 127, 131, 207, 213, 240, 244, 322, 586, 772, 778, 1144, 1145, 1146
—x. 5, 8, 10, 99, 407, 445, 447, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1053, 1110, 1287, 1292, 1293, 1294
—xi. 23, 111, 112, 298, 299, 300, 301, 317, 479, 482, 488, 582, 1252
—xii. 27, 212, 326, 327, 624, 672, 709, 727, 759, 1097, 1104, 1108, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1260, 1261, 1263, 1273, 1274, 1369, 1375, 1376, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1395, 1397, 1398
Exeter, Bishop of, xi. 594, 620, 621, 936, 937
—xii. 271, 365, 368, 369, 454

Falmouth, Earl of, xi. 128
—xii. 109, 111, 116, 122, 246

Gage, Viscount, xii. 72, 1105
Glengall, Earl of, xi. 1330
Gloucester, Bishop of, xii. 403
Goderich, Viscount, ix. 778, 1146, 1147
—x. 724
—xi. 124
—xii. 383, 604, 628
Gosford, Earl of, x. 757, 761, 763, 1157
—xi. 311
Grey, Earl, ix. 24, 36, 127, 129, 132, 133, 212, 229, 245, 320, 771, 772, 776, 778, 862
—x. 2, 4, 12, 449, 457, 725, 727, 730, 731, 733, 745, 761, 1046, 1052, 1054, 1056, 1057, 1106
—xi. 26, 102, 112, 119, 124, 125, 300, 301, 309, 604, 638, 641, 858, 863, 865, 939, 1079, 1090, 1092, 1177, 1247, 1251, 1253, 1316, 1329
—xii. 2, 4, 120, 212, 300, 301, 303, 325, 326, 327, 330, 352, 367, 368, 440, 446, 672, 676, 714, 731, 758, 759, 763, 873, 982, 983, 1002, 1021, 1049, 1052, 1063, 1068, 1096, 1097, 1108, 1134, 1216, 1219, 1264, 1265, 1266, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1273, 1394, 1397

Haddington, Earl of, xii. 59, 175, 873, 1022, 1129, 1259, 1261
Harewood, Earl of, xii. 596, 604, 631, 713, 1049, 1051, 1052
Harrowby, Earl of, ix. 21, 131, 233
—xi. 858, 937, 941
—xii. 148, 302, 692, 1255
Holland, Lord, xi. 125, 316, 1329
—xii. 78, 323, 324, 352, 353, 699, 1261, 1398
Howard of Effingham, Lord, xii. 116, 1272

Kenyon, Lord, x. 1156, 1157
—xi. 126, 318, 319, 941, 942
—xii. 328, 496, 498, 982, 983, 1266, 1268, 1269
King, Lord, ix. 832, 833
—x. 674, 677, 678, 680, 844, 851, 1107
—xi. 318, 786, 787, 802, 935, 936, 937, 940, 941, 942, 943, 1090, 1175
—xii. 980, 981, 982, 1366, 1367, 1368, 1376

Lansdown, Marquess of, ix. 242, 244, 1147, 1227
—x. 6, 248, 406, 407, 408, 441, 444, 446, 447, 731, 763, 890, 1269, 1291, 1303
—xii. 288, 1393
Leinster, Duke of, xi. 591, 603, 1250
Lichfield, Bishop of, xii. 1391
Limerick, Earl of, x. 257, 675, 677
—xii. 26, 127
Lincoln, Bishop of, xii. 244
Llandaff, Bishop of, xi. 633, 941
—xii. 287
London, Bishop of, x. 443, 847, 888, 1157, 1286
—xi. 109, 111, 301, 317, 319, 592, 801, 864, 933, 937
—xii. 267, 1367, 1368
Londonderry, Marquess of, ix. 834
—x. 729, 1040, 1042, 1043, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1055, 1057, 1104, 1106
—xi. 101, 298, 633, 1091, 1093, 1329, 1330
—xii. 74, 78, 116, 120, 369, 1020, 1095, 1096, 1104, 1133, 1216, 1267, 1378, 1390, 1398
Longford, Earl of, xi. 1309
Lorton, Viscount, x. 255, 763
—xi. 241
Lyndhurst, Lord, xii. 428, 446, 677, 727, 999, 1001
Lynedoch, Lord, ix. 829, 831
Lyttleton, Lord, ix. 12
—xii. 1266, 1267

Malmesbury, Earl of, xi. 1093
—xii. 1102, 1260, 1376
Mansfield, Earl of, ix. 830
—xii. 129, 1008
Manvers, Earl, xii. 723, 1107
Melbourne, Viscount, ix. 131, 229, 250, 770, 772, 834
—x. 10, 741, 760, 876, 1292, 1293, 1294
—xi. 125, 298, 299, 479, 1248, 1249, 1252, 1330
—xii. 44, 534, 631, 751, 1365
Minto, Earl of, xii. 877
Montague, Lord, xi. 618

Morley, Lord, xii. 1134
Mulgrave, Earl of, xii. 1027, 1030, 1391

Napier, Lord, xii. 1367, 1370
Newcastle, Duke of, xii. 709, 1058, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1108, 1133, 1219, 1220, 1257
Norfolk, Duke of, xi. 589, 590
Northumberland, Duke of, xi. 126

Plunkett, Lord, x. 8, 250, 256, 448, 458, 462, 752, 756, 858, 869, 881, 1043, 1044, 1046, 1051, 1052, 1057
 —xi. 104, 125, 582, 633, 1248, 1252, 1304, 1305, 1328, 1329
Plymouth, Earl of, xii. 761
Ponsonby, Lord, x. 1105

Radnor, Earl of, x. 850, 883, 1042, 1043, 1045
 —xi. 618, 805
 —xii. 235, 695, 1061, 1062, 1262, 1272, 1376
Richmond, Duke of, x. 888, 1156, 1157
 —xi. 297, 298
 —xii. 106, 109, 110, 1259, 1397
Rochester, Bishop of, xii. 400
Roden, Earl of, x. 751, 756, 851, 869, 892
 —xi. 241, 623, 1086, 1251, 1311, 1316
 —xii. 211, 212, 324, 524, 981, 1031, 1098
Roseberry, Earl of, xi. 599
 —xii. 673, 872, 873
Rutland, Duke of, x. 680
 —xii. 1045

Salisbury, Marquess of, ix. 130, 1145
 —x. 723
 —xi. 127, 593, 787
 —xii. 53, 111, 672, 984, 1028, 1135, 1256, 1367, 1393, 1394, 1395, 1397
Seaford, Lord, xii. 609
Seagrave, Lord, xii. 1126
Shrewsbury, Earl of, xii. 122, 127, 234
Stourton, Lord, xii. 51
Strangford, Viscount, ix. 587, 1226
 —x. 14, 18
 —xi. 3, 28, 499
Suffield, Lord, xi. 111, 127, 301, 302, 315, 317, 318, 593, 594, 795, 931, 933, 934, 938, 940, 941, 942, 943, 1166
 —xii. 496, 602, 1261, 1267, 1391
Suffolk, Earl of, xii. 760, 1001
Sussex, Duke of, ix. 1148, 1151
 —x. 1
 —xii. 212, 669, 672

Templemore, Lord, xii. 532
Tenterden, Lord, ix. 1227
 —x. 986
 —xi. 593, 802, 941, 942, 1251, 1274
 —xii. 397
Teynham, Lord, ix. 1144, 1147
 —x. 851, 1045, 1297
 —xi. 300, 1252
 —xii. 212, 213

Wellington, Duke of, ix. 874
 —x. 724, 732, 735, 744, 881, 891, 1294, 1305
 —xi. 21, 103, 124, 298, 302, 314, 486, 620, 621, 641, 869, 938, 1092, 1248, 1251, 1323, 1331
 —xii. 120, 159, 243, 300, 301, 369, 413, 617, 697, 993
Westmeath, Marquess of, ix. 772, 833, 1226
 —x. 257
 —xi. 1251, 1293, 1315, 1331
 —xii. 523
Wharncliffe, Lord, x. 1056
 —xi. 300, 480, 487, 863, 1090, 1093, 1087, 1252, 1331
 —xii. 177, 712, 1060, 1063, 1098, 1122, 1258, 1267, 1392, 1394, 1397

Wicklow, Earl of, ix, 131, 234, 768, 771, 833
 —x. 3, 249, 255, 448, 453, 757, 760, 762, 873, 887, 888, 1282, 1302
 —xi. 125, 126, 298, 478, 583, 590, 647
 —xii. 325, 499, 535, 750, 751, 1106, 1364
Winchilsea, Earl of, ix. 133
 —xi. 939, 1076, 1087, 1311
 —xii. 213, 352, 530, 712, 981, 1017, 1054, 1057, 1103, 1126, 1132, 1263, 1265, 1266, 1270, 1271
Worcester, Bishop of, x. 682
Wynford, Lord, ix. 833, 1151, 1183
 —x. 8, 18, 678, 680
 —xi. 786, 799, 941, 1248, 1274, 1275
 —xii. 106, 108, 109, 328, 330, 628, 1119, 1133, 1134, 1250, 1272, 1366, 1393, 1396, 1398

York, Archbishop of, xii. 1043

II.—HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Acheson, Lord, x. 1010, 1113, 1162
Adam, Admiral, x. 1093
 —xi. 1311
Adeane, Mr., ix. 1012, 1118
 —x. 382, 1260
 —xi. 687
Advocate, the Lord, ix. 297, 632, 808, 1143, 1195

—x. 389, 401, 438, 440, 470
—xi. 88, 89, 1184
—xii. 205, 1175, 1403, 1407

Agnew, Sir Andrew, x. 216
—xii. 1135

Althorp, Right Hon. Lord, (Chancellor of the Exchequer) ix. 3, 97, 100, 102, 104, 126, 127, 139, 141, 143, 150, 153, 154, 155, 173, 178, 191, 192, 205, 206, 257, 258, 329, 330, 334, 335, 339, 418, 419, 423, 424, 426, 429, 573, 576, 577, 629, 632, 645, 646, 663, 687, 689, 690, 694, 701, 718, 721, 738, 748, 752, 757, 761, 762, 791, 811, 813, 816, 820, 821, 822, 825, 902, 968, 989, 999, 1006, 1010, 1015, 1037, 1052, 1074, 1090, 1097, 1098, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1107, 1109, 1110, 1111, 1114, 1127, 1128, 1140, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1203, 1207, 1209, 1220, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1233, 1234, 1236, 1238, 1242, 1252, 1256, 1257, 1258, 1259, 1261, 1264, 1285, 1293, 1318, 1338, 1348, 1350
—x. 24, 31, 40, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 59, 60, 61, 66, 76, 78, 79, 87, 93, 94, 98, 196, 219, 221, 223, 224, 227, 229, 231, 232, 234, 239, 240, 241, 245, 270, 271, 272, 277, 286, 297, 298, 314, 315, 318, 335, 337, 341, 342, 347, 348, 383, 384, 385, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 423, 425, 426, 429, 431, 437, 439, 472, 475, 477, 484, 507, 509, 510, 520, 534, 538, 540, 541, 543, 544, 564, 569, 570, 600, 617, 628, 689, 693, 701, 712, 720, 765, 896, 901, 911, 912, 914, 920, 966, 967, 968, 969, 971, 973, 974, 975, 982, 1038, 1040, 1064, 1065, 1067, 1077, 1078, 1092, 1093, 1103, 1120, 1122, 1137, 1156, 1205, 1234, 1236, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1355
—xi. 40, 70, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 129, 198, 219, 226, 227, 231, 233, 240, 266, 267, 286, 290, 291, 329, 385, 568, 577, 806, 807, 847, 852, 954, 968, 1016, 1023, 1025, 1027, 1038, 1053, 1187, 1230, 1281, 1282, 1364, 1369, 1402
—xii 95, 100, 201, 204, 206, 314, 322, 466, 468, 471, 472, 474, 544, 550, 635, 653, 742, 753, 770, 772, 774, 778, 781, 805, 864, 889, 915, 969, 989, 1036, 1042, 1072, 1078, 1089, 1172, 1356, 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363

Ashley, Lord, ix. 560
—xii. 468, 1038, 1039

Attorney General, ix. 139, 140, 299, 336, 337, 338, 343, 583, 701, 818, 931, 949
—x. 56, 57, 60, 81, 178, 223, 224, 225, 226, 241, 425, 426, 428, 430, 431, 606, 635, 647, 1235
—xi. 284, 491, 492, 570, 852
—xii. 210, 321, 322, 898, 938, 939, 1148, 1168, 1414

Attwood, Mr., ix. 1067, 1298
—x. 617, 1035
—xi. 922
—xii. 1356, 1362

Bainbridge, Mr., xi. 1070

Bankes, Mr. William, ix. 763

Bankes, Mr. George, x. 327, 384, 585, 1027, 1032, 1218
—xi. 58, 60, 81, 285
—xii. 986, 1087

Baring, Mr., ix. 189, 190, 922, 1077, 1121, 1200, 1261, 1272, 1328
—x. 81, 91, 211, 219, 220, 221, 327, 332, 347, 476, 704, 976, 977, 1152, 1260, 1322
—xi. 291, 292, 907, 921, 1032, 1268
—xii. 774, 780, 792, 811, 822, 881, 882, 885, 911, 939, 943, 953, 989, 1042, 1078, 1354, 1358, 1363, 1413

Baring, Sir Thomas, ix. 902, 1102
—xii. 757

Baring, Mr. Francis, x. 510, 981
—xi. 1110, 1165

Bastard, Captain, x. 705, 711, 1101

Bateson, Sir Robert, ix. 798, 894, 1095
—x. 24, 35, 40, 261, 286, 496, 684, 1060, 1111, 1112, 1114, 1186
—xii. 896, 1139, 1209

Bayntun, Mr., ix. 1231

Beaumont, Mr., xii. 544, 920, 1276

Benett, Mr., ix. 1113
—x. 191, 194, 229, 231, 309, 467
—xi. 1244
—xii. 1414

Bentinck, Lord George, xi. 1042, 1112,

Beresford, Colonel, ix. 707

Berkeley, Captain, ix. 1120
—x. 97, 375, 1123
—xi. 1349
—xii. 925

Bernal, Mr., ix. 690, 822, 825, 981, 1101
—x. 223, 296, 623, 668, 697, 1149
—xi. 43, 1234
—xii. 487

Best, Mr., xi. 78, 80

Blackney, Mr., ix. 711, 713, 720
—x. 103, 235, 316, 412, 414, 989
—xi. 250

Blake, Sir Francis, ix. 1230, 1231

Blamire, Mr., ix. 976, 979, 1227
—x. 668
—xi. 398

Bodkin, Mr., xi. 134

Boldero, Captain, x. 54, 56, 60
—xi. 1027, 1041, 1285

Bourke, Sir John, ix. 474, 615
—x. 575, 662
—xi. 135, 1142, 1285
—xii. 477

Brabazon, Lord, x. 383

Briscoe, Mr., ix. 575, 577, 649, 826, 903
—x. 258, 259, 269, 392, 393, 440, 907, 1067, 1222
—xi. 206
—xii. 194, 317, 319, 321, 322, 483, 666, 668, 1276

Brougham, Mr. William, ix. 253, 649, 651
—x. 600

—xii. 195, 200
Browne, Mr. Dominick, ix. 284, 289, 743
—xi. 174
—xii. 633, 980
Browne, Mr. John, ix. 289, 616
—x. 1187
—xi. 1270
—xii. 86
Brownlow, Mr., x. 1332
—xi. 134, 156, 976
Bruce, Mr. Cumming, ix. 636
—x. 405, 1087
—xi. 1164, 1165
—xii. 1208
Brydges, Sir John, ix. 138, 706, 715, 980
—xi. 499
Bulwer, Mr. Henry Lytton, ix. 299, 367
—x. 1001
Burdett, Sir Francis, ix. 104, 116, 121, 1091, 1281
—xi. 947
—xii. 893, 959, 964, 965
Burge, Mr., ix. 1351
—x. 220, 430, 508, 535, 967, 972, 1256
—xi. 39, 40, 83, 290, 291, 292, 329, 809, 817, 841
—xii. 549
Burrell, Sir Charles, x. 465, 468, 531
—xi. 234
—xii. 317, 980
Buxton, Mr. Fowell, x. 1262
—xi. 291, 838, 841
Byng, Mr., x. 205, 484, 491
—xi. 265
Byng, Sir John, xi. 1225

Callaghan, Mr., ix. 205, 713
—x. 75, 521, 907
—xi. 1107, 1374
—xii. 1401, 1402
Calvert, Mr. Nicholson, ix. 827
—x. 663
Campbell, Mr. John, ix. 125, 126, 138, 563, 589, 701, 702, 761, 978, 979, 1188, 1191, 1230, 1247
—x. 57, 65, 99, 220, 226, 246, 396, 397, 403, 430, 615, 662, 663, 668, 669, 695, 1167
—xii. 105, 202, 210, 315, 744, 753, 757, 979, 1174, 1413, 1414
Campbell, Mr. Walter, ix. 1233
—x. 519, 982
Carter, Mr. Bonham, x. 78
—xi. 227
Carew, Mr., x. 311
—xi. 170, 1163
Castlereagh, Lord, x. 1113
—xii. 633
Cavendish, Lord, ix. 37
Chandos, Marquess of, ix. 184, 214, 1115
—x. 206, 915, 966, 1237
—xi. 34, 35, 83
—xii. 635
Chapman, Mr., ix. 893
—x. 102, 260
—xi. 247, 1053, 1168
Clerk, Sir George, ix. 808, 1017, 1143, 1194, 1350
—x. 63, 76, 78, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 293, 295, 296, 341, 367, 439, 480, 518, 821, 970, 1081, 1096, 1097, 1322
—xi. 331, 336, 924, 925, 928, 929, 1185, 1187, 1352
—xii. 210, 472, 493, 1175
Clive, Lord, ix. 193, 200
Clive, Mr. C. Bolton, x. 80, 81
Cockburn, Sir George, x. 54, 59, 288, 364, 829, 1320
—xi. 337, 924, 926, 927, 936, 1333
—xii. 545, 742
Colborne, Mr. Ridley, xi. 1018, 1268
—xii. 467, 471, 1411, 1413
Conolly, Colonel, x. 37, 41, 259, 516, 685, 701, 1083, 1113, 1200, 1202
—xi. 170, 250, 1270, 1278
—xii. 465, 539, 1425
Cooper, Mr. E. J., ix. 797
Coote, Sir Charles, xi. 1158
—xii. 1417
Copeland, Mr. Alderman, ix. 705, 707
—xi. 1277
Courtenay, Mr., ix. 577, 1024, 1086, 1272
—x. 62, 108, 185, 305, 713
—xi. 906
—xii. 321, 494, 658, 1361
Crampton, Mr., ix. 225, 558, 589, 593, 706, 707, 894, 1277
—x. 43, 101, 416, 577, 633, 643, 1182, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1216, 1221
—xi. 176, 325, 1245, 1270, 1271, 1273, 1384
—xii. 94, 95, 96, 104, 311, 1209, 1415
Cripps, Mr., ix. 153
—x. 48, 50, 82, 416
Croker, Right Hon. Mr., ix. 36, 46, 57, 99, 102, 145, 181, 182, 257, 258, 330, 331, 333, 392, 419, 564, 568, 573, 625, 627, 648, 652, 675, 676, 679, 681, 682, 685, 696, 738, 746, 747, 748, 749, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 758, 761, 763, 981, 998, 999, 1003, 1013, 1090, 1101, 1196, 1198, 1203, 1205, 1224, 1231, 1284
—x. 45, 207, 210, 218, 226, 230, 232, 234, 235, 240, 241, 243, 265, 266, 278, 281, 283, 289, 321, 324, 325, 332, 343, 376, 536, 538, 539, 559, 567, 568, 569, 582, 594, 601, 608, 616, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 626, 631, 632, 688, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 698, 700, 701, 702, 703, 711, 712, 714, 715, 716, 719, 720, 765, 832, 898, 909, 910, 912, 913, 914, 915, 1065, 1068, 1094, 1102, 1120, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1143, 1148, 1149, 1151, 1232, 1263, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1268
—xi. 33, 34, 38, 43, 44, 45, 46, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 62, 72, 80, 81, 208, 220, 222, 463, 465, 739

—xii. 1208, 1209
Curteis, Mr., ix. 1120
—xi. 969
—xii. 893, 979, 1043
Cust, Mr. Edward, ix. 473
—x. 621, 1331

Dalrymple, Sir Adolphus, x. 497, 501, 502, 613, 1131
—xi. 1260, 1288, 1289
Davies, Colonel, ix. 253, 324, 326, 327, 1038, 1052, 1089, 1135, 1243, 1267
—x. 133, 230, 386, 401, 478, 508, 563, 1064, 1103
—xi. 412, 413, 1025, 1253, 1266
—xii. 776, 987
Dawson, Mr. George, ix. 107, 138, 141, 142, 218, 265, 285, 557, 560, 793, 798, 1312, 1318
—x. 473, 475, 496, 527, 689, 690, 897, 1206, 1207, 1212, 1213, 1220
—xi. 1015, 1016, 1047, 1099, 1159, 1243
—xii. 101, 202, 205, 319, 320, 321, 467
Denison, Mr., ix. 1049, 1051
—xii. 970
Denison, Mr. Evelyn, ix. 1223, 1224, 1234
—x. 1078
—xi. 33
Dick, Mr., x. 61
Dixon, Mr., ix. 1017, 1018
—x. 33, 195, 269, 405, 505, 507, 518, 670, 895, 901, 977, 1224, 1319
—xi. 296, 1184, 1186, 1277, 1280
—xii. 203, 481, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 492, 551
Douglas, Mr. Keith, ix. 1196
—x. 347, 509, 816, 967, 1130, 1239
—xi. 83, 291, 848, 849, 1361
—xii. 1140, 1406
Douglas, Mr. Charles, x. 530
Doyle, Sir John M., ix. 96, 188
—x. 145
—xi. 902, 1234
—xii. 572, 591, 1428
Drake, Mr., x. 623
Duncannon, Viscount, ix. 144, 145, 146, 147, 152, 153, 574, 575, 576, 646
—xi. 966, 970, 1151
—xii. 468
Duncombe, Mr., ix. 1332
—x. 199
—xi. 559, 1134
—xii. 545, 549, 778, 885, 886, 889, 917, 919, 920, 949
Dundas, Mr. Robert Adam, ix. 1015
—x. 345, 1236
—xi. 1184
—xii. 736, 1194, 1404

Eastnor, Lord, ix. 323, 324, 325, 697, 726
—x. 46, 1038
Ebrington, Lord, ix. 188, 1197, 1200, 1201 1202
—x. 76, 152, 211, 414, 1354
—xii. 322, 771, 780, 781, 864, 906, 951, 959, 1036
Eliot, Lord, x. 130
—xi. 871, 923
—xii. 488, 744
Ellice, Mr., ix. 300
Ellis, Mr. Wynn, ix. 255
—x. 583
—xii. 892
Estcourt, Mr., x. 49, 50, 247, 466, 1123
—xii. 475
Evans, Colonel, x. 148, 325, 388, 479, 496, 497, 691, 693
—xi. 134, 898, 922, 1039, 1042, 1214
—xii. 570, 634, 881, 882, 1405, 1411
Ewart, Mr., ix. 124, 203, 997, 1267
—x. 396, 895, 908, 910, 1138, 1148, 1151, 1152
—xi. 280, 948, 1181, 1277
—xii. 662, 987

Fane, Mr. xi. 904
—xii. 319, 551
Ferguson, Sir Ronald, ix. 1051
—x. 1094
Ferguson, Mr. Robert, x. 70, 105, 530, 1224
—xii. 1035
Fergusson, Mr. Cutlar, ix. 110, 116, 121, 589, 640, 691, 695, 808, 988, 1015, 1016, 1096, 1110, 1113, 1114, 1194, 1200, 1242
—x. 46, 47, 83, 385, 389, 440, 524, 576, 657, 664, 938, 1083, 1224, 1243
—xi. 1057, 1069, 1186
—xii. 206, 209, 636, 740, 1135, 1141, 1190, 1195
Fitzroy, Lord James, xii. 1413
Fitzroy, Mr. H., x. 702, 703
Forbes, Sir Charles, ix. 96, 187, 633, 673, 765
—xii. 199, 202, 661, 1194
Fox, Colonel, xii. 661
Freemantle, Sir Thomas, x. 347, 527
—xi. 78, 82, 84
—xii. 481, 494
French, Mr. Arthur, x. 286
Freshfield, Mr., ix. 753, 754, 1108, 1242
—x. 49, 544
—xi. 223, 852

Gilbert, Mr. Davies, ix. 1100, 1105, 1256
—x. 259, 557, 626
—xii. 975
Gillon, Mr., ix. 636, 1017
—x. 75, 188, 438, 467, 513, 983
—xi. 277, 1100
—xii. 890, 986
Gisborne, Mr., ix. 1109
—xi. 807, 1147
—xii. 1362
Godson, Mr., xii. 744
Gordon, Mr., ix. 450
—x. 327, 425

Gordon, Mr. J. E., ix. 329, 634, 903, 1044
—x. 404, 438, 440, 1057, 1162, 1203
—xi. 88, 245, 329, 1011, 1014, 1181, 1184
—xii. 80, 307, 465, 539, 541, 634, 737, 1084, 1143, 1171

Gordon, Mr. Robert, x. 62, 275, 283, 285, 288, 302, 304, 967, 1065
—xi. 83, 221, 832, 967, 1042, 1258
—xii. 551, 1040

Gordon, Capt. William, x. 513, 531

Goulburn, Mr., ix. 145, 149, 150, 223, 289, 299, 338, 339, 343, 560, 573, 576, 631, 645, 670, 689, 691, 694, 695, 702, 720, 722, 748, 753, 754, 755, 759, 762, 809, 812, 813, 817, 902, 987, 1013, 1014, 1019, 1026, 1202, 1257, 1285, 1350
—x. 31, 47, 54, 57, 77, 78, 79, 81, 93, 94, 97, 219, 221, 222, 223, 228, 234, 240, 241, 246, 270, 272, 275, 286, 297, 306, 342, 349, 394, 397, 420, 505, 509, 510, 528, 568, 662, 906, 967, 973, 1122, 1253, 1262, 1266, 1323
—xi. 63, 71, 82, 226, 227, 231, 292, 296, 844, 852, 855, 1103, 1213, 1215, 1243, 1270, 1346, 1357
—xii. 201, 204, 206, 754

Graham, Sir James, ix. 810
—x. 272, 273, 278, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 287, 290, 291, 292, 293, 295, 296, 297, 349, 375, 376, 386, 478, 480, 765, 805, 832, 970, 1314, 1323
—xi. 330, 335, 336, 339, 413, 871, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 1343, 1346

Grant, Mr. Robert, xi. 710, 1223, 1230, 1267
—xii. 1412

Grant, Mr. Charles, ix. 1020, 1026
—x. 406, 949, 1037, 1204

Grattan, Mr. James, ix. 296, 618, 710, 1232
—x. 319, 576, 634, 1366
—xi. 328, 1002, 1164, 1367, 1379
—xii. 82, 309, 1402, 1420, 1428

Grattan, Mr. Henry, x. 20, 73, 416, 525, 577, 663, 965, 989, 1063, 1114, 1201, 1202, 1215, 1351
—xi. 244, 250, 490, 806, 977, 986, 1155, 1165
—xii. 465, 466, 537, 540, 583, 1401

Green, Mr. xi. 944

Greene, Mr., x. 1222
—xi. 1279, 1280

Grosvenor, Earl, x. 992, 1039, 1040, 1115
—xi. 1266

Grosvenor, Lord Robert, x. 664, 905
—xi. 328
—xii. 1144

Gurney, Mr. Hudson, xi. 502
—xii. 756

Halliburton, Mr., x. 1309
—xii. 1410

Handcock, Mr. xi. 247

Hardinge, Sir Henry, ix. 1201
—x. 269, 277, 385, 387, 479, 483, 488, 493, 495, 497, 501, 502, 509, 968, 970
—xi. 267, 268, 339, 1028, 1188, 1204, 1215, 1221, 1223, 1228, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1285, 1287, 1289, 1290, 1291, 1292
—xii. 570, 909, 911, 918, 923, 991, 992

Harvey, Mr. D. W., ix. 219, 252, 589, 593, 1028, 1029, 1030
—xii. 81, 985

Heneage, Mr., x. 1329
—xi. 852

Heron, Sir Robert, ix. 824, 1111, 1120
—x. 301

Herries, Mr., ix. 206, 424, 646, 903, 967, 1051
—x. 276, 282, 669
—xi. 328

Heywood, Mr., ix. 1267
—x. 910, 1031
—xi. 278, 396
—xii. 870, 1041

Hobhouse, Sir John Cam, ix. 430, 763, 765, 1257
—x. 301, 432, 435, 480, 484, 487, 496, 497, 499, 502, 503, 897, 898
—xi. 339, 728, 1018, 1037, 1038, 1202, 1204, 1219, 1227, 1281, 1282, 1286, 1287, 1289, 1291

Hodges, Mr., ix. 1120, 1230
—x. 345, 392
—xi. 237, 239
—xii. 193, 194, 979, 991

Hodgson, Mr., ix. 977, 978
—x. 60, 664, 1130, 1205, 1266, 1319
—xi. 63, 72
—xii. 543, 545

Holdsworth, Mr., x. 704, 1101
—xi. 228

Hope, Mr. John T., ix. 325
—xi. 386, 900
—xii. 1186

Hotham, Lord, x. 54

Howard, Mr. Philip, ix. 977, 1243
—x. 666
—xi. 205, 276, 397, 1155
—xii. 316, 590

Howick, Lord, x. 32, 508, 535, 666, 672, 1251
—xi. 35, 36, 38, 41, 290, 292, 815, 817, 1214
—xii. 547, 551

Hughes, Mr. Hughes, xi. 1156, 1276
—xii. 490, 783, 986

Hume, Mr., ix. 102, 103, 105, 127, 143, 144, 145, 149, 150, 152, 153, 155, 202, 206, 223, 224, 225, 227, 559, 562, 574, 575, 577, 580, 589, 590, 643, 646, 649, 669, 710, 719, 765, 779, 781, 792, 798, 809, 811, 895, 931, 1029, 1030, 1034, 1037, 1046, 1085, 1137, 1184, 1185, 1187, 1225, 1233, 1280, 1281, 1350
—x. 27, 28, 32, 105, 193, 198, 228, 229, 231, 232, 268, 276, 282, 284, 285, 287, 290, 291, 292, 293, 305, 306, 315, 376, 377, 379, 389, 391, 392, 393, 400, 401, 417, 423, 438, 441, 465, 470, 472, 474, 484, 485, 491, 495, 496, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 510, 528, 534,

584, 661, 673, 685, 830, 896, 903, 969, 971, 972, 977, 991, 1085, 1113, 1115, 1116, 1223, 1242, 1321
—xi. 160, 205, 260, 292, 336, 491, 806, 833, 900, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 945, 1029, 1038, 1039, 1112, 1153, 1180, 1207, 1223, 1226, 1264, 1268, 1276, 1287, 1289, 1291, 1356, 1364, 1368, 1369
—xii. 99, 105, 194, 201, 202, 203, 209, 306, 308, 315, 317, 319, 465, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 477, 478, 479, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 489, 494, 569, 586, 660, 667, 733, 736, 753, 754, 757, 771, 807, 811, 823, 882, 884, 896, 950, 951, 967, 985, 988, 989, 990, 1040, 1071, 1072, 1085, 1195, 1275, 1279, 1324, 1359, 1362

Hunt, Mr., ix. 86, 100, 115, 140, 145, 146, 154, 155, 185, 215, 216, 218, 253, 255, 298, 302, 315, 327, 426, 545, 563, 576, 577, 582, 590, 594, 642, 651, 674, 701, 702, 715, 765, 780, 789, 799, 816, 820, 825, 828, 902, 956, 977, 1006, 1012, 1046, 1049, 1088, 1091, 1093, 1119, 1120, 1185, 1191, 1209, 1222, 1253, 1257, 1258, 1259, 1260, 1276, 1278, 1281, 1334
—x. 21, 22, 26, 48, 51, 191, 195, 196, 198, 216, 217, 220, 222, 223, 231, 232, 233, 234, 238, 247, 259, 270, 289, 290, 292, 293, 300, 307, 308, 330, 340, 377, 378, 379, 386, 390, 397, 399, 400, 401, 421, 423, 436, 439, 468, 470, 472, 488, 492, 495, 508, 531, 582, 618, 696, 698, 717, 718, 831, 832, 838, 895, 907, 956, 969, 974, 975, 1038, 1064, 1069, 1098, 1117, 1152, 1155, 1224, 1260, 1373
—xi. 34, 72, 204, 206, 232, 251, 273, 280, 284, 285, 385, 398, 409, 492, 577, 778, 910, 944, 946, 955, 968, 1005, 1006, 1012, 1035, 1042, 1075, 1094, 1135, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1232, 1234, 1271, 1278, 1280
—xii. 194, 200, 303, 304, 309, 310, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 322, 473, 474, 475, 478, 484, 485, 486, 495, 591, 663, 666, 667, 668, 669, 743, 744, 752, 753, 780, 783, 862, 890, 904, 971, 979, 1034, 1038, 1043, 1172

Ingestrie, Lord, x. 663
—xi. 328, 1361
—xii. 977

Inglis, Sir Robert, ix. 124, 153, 195, 206, 225, 227, 329, 423, 429, 436, 577, 578, 617, 628, 791, 799, 807, 1277, 1289
—x. 97, 151, 323, 344, 414, 438, 441, 688, 832, 1203, 1370
—xi. 323, 429, 1154, 1156
—xii. 81, 101, 194, 308, 310, 313, 314, 316, 318, 470, 477, 478, 481, 495, 541, 664, 666, 668, 739, 742, 754, 878, 944, 1209

Ingilby, Sir William, ix. 1205, 1207
—x. 1324

Irving, Mr., xi. 84

James, Mr., ix. 1347
—x. 217, 440, 666, 913, 1222, 1262
—xi. 280, 393
—xii. 774, 778, 878, 880

Jephson, Mr., x. 424, 576, 684, 1130, 1374
—xi. 155, 1151, 1272, 1274, 1396
—xii. 104, 105

Johnston, Mr. James, x. 414
—xi. 1015
—xii. 82, 1139, 1411

Johnstone, Sir John, ix. 712, 1188, 1192
—x. 1095
—xii. 81

Johnstone, Mr. John, xi. 295

Johnstone, Mr. Andrew, x. 1061, 1167
—xii. 306, 309, 1183

Jones, Mr., ix. 1105
—x. 245, 622
—xi. 175, 329, 1151, 1271

Kearsley, Mr., ix. 1348
—x. 1031, 1094, 1203
—xi. 398, 851

Kemmis, Mr., xi. 1232

Kennedy, Mr., ix. 643
—xii. 1406

Killeen, Lord, x. 1114
—xi. 201
—xii. 86

Knight, Mr. Gally, x. 143, 427
—xi. 904, 982
—xii. 470

Knight, Mr. James L., ix. 758, 762, 811, 812, 1106, 1107, 1109, 1110
—x. 219, 220
—xi. 73

Labouchere, Mr., ix. 200, 256
—x. 507, 666, 905, 973, 1139, 1205
—xi. 292
—xii. 654, 773, 969

Lamb, Hon. Mr. George, ix. 68, 154, 155, 765, 1051
—x. 1063, 1329
—xi. 263, 268, 492, 945, 952, 1018, 1095, 1282
—xii. 103, 317, 1090

Lambert, Mr. x. 309, 323, 332, 575, 1062
—xi. 1006, 1043, 1075, 1152
—xii. 309, 589, 590

Langton, Mr. Gore, ix. 254, 985
—x. 246
—xii. 771

Lascelles, Mr., ix. 821

Leader, Mr., ix. 89, 135, 138, 187, 559, 594, 595, 606
—x. 25, 101, 285, 410, 414, 493, 574, 634, 662, 765, 980, 1060, 1358
—xi. 135, 243, 245, 325, 977, 1163, 1238, 1273, 1364, 1400
—xii. 88, 1399, 1422

Lefroy, Mr., x. 69, 71, 264, 322, 392, 635, 1062, 1175, 1179, 1180
—xi. 326, 402, 491, 995, 1158, 1274
—xii. 96, 308, 1399

Lefroy, Mr. Anthony, xi. 1144
—xii. 83

Lennard, Mr., ix. 220
  —x. 61, 62
  —xi. 396
  —xii. 752, 977
Lennox, Lord William, ix. 481
  —x. 837, 1320
  —xi. 394, 945, 1278
  —xii. 305, 314, 892, 896, 1093, 1411
Lennox, Lord George, x. 465, 1220
Lewis, Mr. Frankland, ix. 1208
Lindsey, Colonel, ix. 490
  —x. 439, 1093
  —xi. 1102
  —xii. 735, 1041, 1138, 1181
Littleton, Mr., x. 65, 417, 915, 1064, 1124, 1154, 1267, 1268
  —xi. 61, 76
  —xii. 733, 984
Lopez, Sir Ralph, ix. 683, 685
  —xi. 907
Loughborough, Lord, x. 702
  —xii. 1187
Lowther, Mr., x. 1121
Lushington, Doctor, ix. 941
  —xi. 42, 268, 953, 1113
  —xii. 656, 757
Luttrell, Mr., xi. 224

Maberley, Mr., ix. 148, 150, 152
Maberley, Colonel, x. 663, 669, 673, 674
  —xi. 1212
Macaulay, Mr., ix. 378
  —x. 842, 926
  —xi. 450, 465
  —xii. 779, 848, 922, 923, 992
Macdonald, Sir James, ix. 1025
Mackenzie, Mr., x. 519, 1223
  —xi. 394, 1166, 1185
Mackinnon, Mr., ix. 560, 763, 1260, 1268
  —x. 202, 205, 714
  —xi. 517
Mackintosh, Sir James, ix. 1097
  —x. 626, 632, 651
Macleod, Mr., 1185
Macnamara, Major, xi. 1271
Mahon, Lord, ix. 370
  —xi. 414
Maitland, Lord, x. 595
  —xi. 425
Malcolm, Sir John, x. 386
  —xi. 425
  —xii. 197, 200
Mandeville, Lord, x. 1188
Marryatt, Mr., x. 975
  —xi. 39, 239
Martin, Sir Byam, x. 277, 361, 817
  —xi. 928, 1337, 1349
  —xii. 193
Member, An Hon., ix. 175, 185, 647, 755, 821, 826, 979, 1003, 1017, 1190, 1258
  —x. 64, 77, 80, 206, 210, 234, 270, 298, 388, 396, 487, 636, 693, 714, 715, 968, 1015, 1172, 1232, 1323
  —xi. 221, 284, 581, 1099, 1223
  —xii. 668, 1355
Milton, Lord, ix. 651, 702, 821, 986, 1007, 1041, 1080, 1091, 1103, 1106, 1115, 1142, 1190, 1193, 1266
  —x. 55, 96, 199, 231, 244, 246, 296, 319, 340, 538, 539, 566, 631, 715, 955, 992, 1149, 1155, 1341
  —xi. 73, 82, 232, 265, 412
  —xii. 780, 910, 918, 948, 1072
Moreton, Mr., xi. 278
Morison, Mr., ix. 1094
  —xi. 1263
Morrison, Mr., ix. 1091
Morpeth, Lord, ix. 98, 102, 125, 126, 214, 216, 257, 563, 709, 716, 780, 821, 1093, 1185, 1186, 1191, 1267
  —x. 23, 667, 1154
  —xi. 32, 64, 393, 1013, 1015
  —xii. 569, 823, 968, 1277
Mullins, Mr., ix. 632
  —xi. 1006, 1062
Murray, Sir George, ix. 637, 645, 995, 1018, 1203, 1232
  —x. 54, 57, 107, 108, 149, 506, 507, 933, 981, 1091, 1092, 1093
  —xi. 340, 1110, 1187, 1211
  —xii. 538, 540, 923, 938, 1196, 1407
Musgrave, Sir Richard, x. 987
  —xi. 173, 176

Newark, Lord, ix. 749
  —xi. 234
  —xii. 1092
Newport, Sir John, ix. 708
  —xii. 772
Nugent, Lord, x. 467, 686, 689
  —xi. 398

O'Connell, Mr., ix. 560, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 712, 783, 788, 793, 798, 804, 814, 815, 894, 940, 978, 997, 1038, 1042, 1095, 1104, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1276, 1278, 1279
  —x. 20, 23, 24, 25, 44, 66, 68, 101, 182, 191, 194, 196, 214, 261, 315, 377, 378, 383, 416, 429, 576, 632, 633, 634, 644, 685, 688, 764, 905, 1341
  —xii. 737, 739, 742, 842, 892, 972, 1037, 1137, 1142, 1400, 1402
O'Connell, Mr. Maurice, x. 578
  —xi. 278, 970, 971, 978, 1245
  —xii. 85, 86, 309, 574, 773
O'Connor, Mr., ix. 1232
  —xi. 162, 667
  —xii. 893
O'Ferrall, Mr., ix. 204
  —x. 382, 836, 1202
  —xi. 135, 171, 250, 1157, 1242, 1245, 1272, 1392
  —xii. 1421
Offley, Mr., xi. 501

Ord, Mr., x. 714
Oxmantown, Lord, xii. 1415

Paget, Mr., ix. 126, 650, 707, 967, 979
  —x. 326, 662, 1205
  —xi. 410
  —xii. 1035
Palmer, Mr. Fyshe, ix. 1014
  —x. 98, 325, 467
  —xii. 735, 974, 1180
Palmer, General, xi. 530
Palmerston, Viscount, ix. 106, 124, 806, 963, 968, 1014, 1192, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1283, 1284, 1352
  —x. 108, 153, 635, 636, 1228, 1231, 1368, 1369
  —xi. 132, 877, 890, 894, 910, 921
  —xii. 487, 558, 570, 744, 935, 938
Parnell, Sir Henry, x. 274, 475, 483, 500, 685, 1364, 1368, 1369
  —xi. 1020, 1027, 1029, 1038, 1157, 1163
  —xii. 1360, 1416, 1428
Pearse, Mr., xii. 1360
Peel, Sir Robert, ix. 72, 121, 140, 143, 173, 175, 190, 191, 200, 205, 226, 258, 328, 330, 333, 335, 423, 527, 660, 686, 688, 690, 701, 716, 718, 719, 730, 757, 758 761, 782, 792, 957, 981, 1045, 1046, 1094, 1097, 1101, 1117, 1119, 1141, 1143, 1211, 1219, 1236, 1237, 1239, 1339
  —x. 52, 53, 75, 162, 171, 174, 215, 224, 226, 228, 273, 274, 277, 297, 298, 299, 301, 307, 317, 320, 336, 339, 340, 348, 374, 375, 385, 386, 471, 479, 480, 534, 614, 628, 651, 914, 940, 1064, 1072, 1097, 1136, 1229, 1231, 1234, 1342
  —xi. 41, 43, 67, 181, 206, 207, 222, 270, 273, 283, 295, 410, 739, 886, 891, 894, 921, 922, 952, 954
  —xii. 208, 320, 466, 467, 468, 485, 486, 562, 570, 571, 636, 637, 741, 742, 753, 777, 780, 781, 830, 887, 948, 950, 992, 1072, 1162, 1171
Peel, Mr. William, ix. 993
  —xi. 169, 328
Peel, Mr. Edmund, ix. 1051
Peel, Mr. Yates, ix. 1261
Pelham, Mr. Cressett, ix. 574, 579, 589, 673, 792, 819, 985, 1006, 1039, 1203
  —x. 49, 75, 91, 106, 140, 216, 218, 259, 273, 319, 910, 969, 974
  —xi. 61, 650, 955, 966, 1362
  —xii. 783
Pemberton, Mr., xi. 443
Penleaze, Mr., ix. 1184
Penrhyn, Mr., xi. 998
Perceval, Mr., ix. 580, 895, 903, 1030, 1048
  —x. 33, 35, 44
  —xi. 577, 578, 580, 1152, 1244
Perceval, Col., ix. 788, 796, 797
  —xi. 1245
  —xii. 465, 1424
Petre, Mr., xi. 278
  —xii. 574, 1413
Phipps, Mr., x. 64
Pigott, Mr., ix. 669
  —x. 622, 623, 718
  —xi. 73, 80, 133, 902
  —xii. 1323
Pollock, Mr. Frederick, ix. 581, 918
  —x. 49, 52, 65, 66, 81, 545, 557, 559, 597, 624
Ponsonby, Mr., xi. 1222, 1223
  —xii. 1415
Porchester, Lord, ix. 343
  —xi. 720
  —xii. 990
Portman, Mr. ix., 156, 195, 199
  —x. 245, 1063
  —xii. 1038, 1040
Praed, Mr., ix. 482, 685, 991, 1013, 1128, 1142, 1204, 1268
  —x. 50, 713, 718
  —xii. 980
Price, Sir Robert, x. 347
  —xii. 1043
Pringle, Mr., ix. 1017
  —xii. 540, 1208

Rae, Sir William, ix. 1194
  —x. 385, 388, 389, 403
  —xi. 88
  —xii. 209
Ramsden, Mr., ix. 1142, 1188
  —x. 531, 1155
Rice, Mr. Spring, ix. 138, 223, 224, 227, 559, 594, 928, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1320
  —x. 25, 27, 282, 285, 286, 300, 303, 306, 307, 308, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 664, 669, 673, 970, 1217, 1233
  —xi. 296, 975, 1102, 1156, 1161, 1222, 1245, 1273, 1278
  —xii. 102, 311, 467, 469, 471, 472, 475, 476, 478, 480, 481, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 489, 490, 492, 493, 494, 668, 1415, 1425
Ridley, Sir Matthew White, ix. 977
  —x. 290, 344, 1139, 1152, 1311, 1324
  —xii. 549, 636, 758, 1362
Robertson, Mr., xi. 1103
Robinson, Mr. George, ix. 88, 139, 227, 254, 325, 593, 672, 760, 825, 826, 941, 1042, 1052, 1057, 1065, 1233, 1272, 1273, 1277, 1284, 1335
  —x. 195, 269, 282, 290, 296, 477, 488, 497, 532, 669, 902, 970, 974, 1025
  —xi. 296, 542, 955, 1180, 1261
  —xii. 84, 310, 311, 316, 318, 319, 466, 544, 566, 636, 826, 1038, 1277, 1356, 1363
Rochford, Colonel, ix. 893
  —x. 260
  —xi. 245, 250, 406
Rose, Sir George, ix. 804
  —x. 97
  —xi. 671
Ross, Mr. Charles, x. 247, 400
Ross, Mr. Horatio, x. 468, 529, 978, 1306

—xi. 1095, 1181, 1185
Russell, Lord John, ix. 37, 156, 175, 182, 190, 206, 332, 492, 566, 570, 572, 652, 657, 674, 675, 680, 690, 691, 695, 698, 733, 745, 746, 747, 749, 754, 755, 756, 758, 761, 947, 956, 983, 986, 1002, 1004, 1016, 1044, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1106, 1108, 1124, 1127, 1134, 1204, 1205, 1216, 1234, 1237, 1243, 1244, 1258
—x. 46, 51, 57, 77, 78, 80, 81, 96, 222, 225, 233, 235, 236, 240, 242, 243, 248, 417, 430, 495, 503, 537, 541, 544, 552, 568, 594, 595, 600, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 694, 695, 696, 697, 700, 705, 710, 712, 715, 716, 717, 720, 908, 909, 913, 949, 1068, 1069, 1078, 1080, 1081, 1095, 1098, 1099, 1119, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1135
—xi. 43, 45, 65, 87, 206, 223, 226, 228, 237, 239, 412, 853, 1208, 1290, 1291
—xii. 635, 926, 932, 950
Ruthven, Mr., ix. 613, 787, 791, 799, 894, 1278
—x. 26, 44, 76, 265, 501, 505, 577, 634, 636, 991, 992, 1203
—xi. 203, 978, 981, 1164, 1269, 1271, 1368, 1369
—xii. 85, 95, 96, 310, 540, 572, 633, 758, 896, 991, 1416

Sadler, Mr., ix. 254, 255, 303, 309, 713, 1083, 1092, 1096, 1097, 1220
—x. 21, 104, 106, 192, 530, 531, 894, 1225
—xi. 205, 340
—xii. 899
St. Paul, Sir Horace, x. 719
Sandon, Lord, ix. 112, 203, 685, 735, 1188, 1192, 1238, 1244, 1267, 1274, 1349
—x. 184, 221, 346, 399, 401, 896, 912, 951, 959, 1150, 1241, 1250, 1251
—xi. 293, 326, 846, 1016, 1240
—xii. 569, 827, 848, 970
Sanford, Mr. ix. 253, 592, 647, 1088, 1185, 1190
—x. 64, 105, 246
—xi. 1263
—xii. 734, 1276
Scarlett, Sir James, ix. 815, 818, 938, 1257, 1265
—x. 616
—xi. 233, 284
Schonswar, Mr., ix. 126, 1191
—x. 54, 105, 397, 666, 1319
—xi. 63, 394, 1151
—xii. 862
Scott, Mr., x. 1080, 1096
Sebright, Sir John, ix. 324
—x. 492
—xi. 1268
—xii. 319
Shaw, Mr., ix. 91, 198, 226, 293, 1278
—x. 20, 26, 41, 72, 97, 101, 102, 238, 262, 286, 316, 393, 413, 414, 415, 416, 525, 658, 663
—xi. 245, 250, 320, 490, 491, 580, 1015, 1128, 1184, 1245
—xii. 83, 102, 311, 313, 464, 465, 466, 1091, 1141, 1174, 1401, 1415, 1425
Sheil, Mr., ix. 95, 192, 226, 290, 327, 629, 690, 691, 708, 709, 718, 789, 1005, 1186, 1277
—x. 21, 27, 40, 70, 72, 234, 236, 322, 383, 401, 424, 525, 626, 631, 837, 959, 1096, 1097, 1204, 1344
—xi. 178, 1006, 1153, 1243, 1273, 1367, 1380, 1382
—xii. 83, 95, 101, 475, 481, 541, 575, 578, 591, 593, 662, 757
Sibthorp, Colonel, ix. 191, 214, 465, 810, 822, 825, 827, 977, 985, 1112, 1204, 1206, 1224
—x. 48, 247, 305, 307, 400, 502, 503, 673, 837, 1330
—xi. 79, 233, 239, 240, 277, 780, 849, 931, 1223, 1225, 1227
—xii. 315, 895, 978, 991, 1092, 1209
Sinclair, Mr. George, ix. 941, 1019
—xi. 233, 240, 1099
Slaney, Mr., ix. 468
—x. 1063
—xi. 439
Smith, Mr. John Abel, ix. 689, 746
—x. 613, 919
Smith, Mr. George R. x. 697
Smith, Mr. Abel, ix. 1114
Solicitor General, ix. 919, 1109, 1126, 1240
—x. 81, 431, 465
Somerset, Lord Granville, ix. 1233
—x. 231, 243, 246, 271, 1078, 1080, 1123, 1131, 1267
—xi. 61, 207, 229, 240, 412
—xii. 103
Speaker, The, ix. 88, 594, 895, 1036, 1037, 1042, 1184, 1185, 1201, 1275, 1276
—x. 31, 384, 965, 989, 991, 1207
—xi. 128, 239, 245, 284, 851
—xii. 918, 920, 923, 951, 964, 965
Spence, Mr., ix. 139, 251, 252, 649, 1188
—x. 64, 66, 655
Stanley, Lord, xi. 946
—xii. 893
Stanley, Mr., ix. 54, 142, 259, 266, 513, 594, 595, 627, 785, 793, 795, 797, 798, 1018
—x. 34, 35, 40, 45, 170, 171, 286, 320, 322, 323, 340, 345, 525, 573, 578, 609, 629, 637, 656, 660, 713, 836, 966, 968, 990, 992, 1059, 1061, 1113, 1114, 1151, 1170, 1172, 1179, 1180, 1206, 1331, 1351, 1366, 1374
—xi. 135, 247, 250, 278, 764, 970, 981, 982, 1005, 1015, 1075, 1137, 1152, 1153, 1154, 1155, 1158, 1241, 1243, 1269, 1272, 1366, 1382, 1392, 1393
—xii. 86, 95, 577, 579, 590, 592, 593, 754, 758, 1418, 1424
Stanley, Sir Edward, ix. 996
Stanley, Mr. John, x. 1035, 1140
—xi. 652
Stephenson, Mr., ix. 682, 684, 1190, 1278
—x. 204, 539, 567, 626, 657
—xii. 470

Stewart, Mr. Patrick M., x. 1257
—xii. 549
Stewart, Mr. Charles, xi. 239, 659
Stormont, Lord, ix. 1090, 1197, 1278
—xii. 542, 543, 544, 964, 1089, 1144
Stuart, Lord Patrick, x. 1128
—xi. 73, 231, 239
Stuart, Lord Dudley, x. 1149
Strickland, Mr., ix. 100, 125, 215, 256, 588, 709, 781, 821, 978, 1004, 1093, 1187, 1191, 1275, 1276
—x. 22, 62, 97, 190, 192, 268, 401, 664, 688, 894, 1155, 1225
—xi. 72, 266, 397, 951, 1014
—xii. 80, 84, 209
Strutt, Mr., xii. 788
Sugden, Sir Edward, ix. 337, 352, 589, 712, 809, 819, 947, 979, 1094, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1258
—x. 43, 47, 51, 79, 80, 81, 82, 96, 97, 98, 232, 233, 235, 236, 398, 399, 400, 421, 426, 428, 431, 432, 436, 540, 541, 543, 634, 655, 665, 922, 1077, 1206, 1216, 1217
—xi. 64, 226, 232, 409, 412, 689, 698, 1072
—xii. 466, 932, 985, 988

Tennyson, Mr., x. 1330
—xi. 406, 411
—xii. 990, 1275, 1277
Thompson, Mr. Alderman, ix. 299
—x. 384, 583, 898, 908
—xi. 33, 240, 910, 929, 1178
—xii. 197, 555, 782, 906, 979
Thomson, Mr. Poulett, ix. 254, 256, 298, 309, 1058, 1304, 1347
—x. 266, 324, 325, 342, 390, 532, 534, 692, 1010, 1025, 1116, 1232, 1246, 1251
—xi. 297, 849, 1258
—xii. 1336
Torrens, Colonel, ix. 103, 254, 1072, 1097
—x. 21, 496, 505, 508, 661
—xi. 504, 1244, 1367, 1375
—xii. 307, 1032, 1356
Trench, Colonel, ix. 1191
—x. 65, 333, 336, 342, 483, 484, (subsequently, Trench, Sir Frederick) 836, 969, 1218
—xi. 902, 955, 970
—xii. 309, 466, 469, 569
Trevor, Mr., ix. 90, 103, 104, 977, 1113, 1190, 1222, 1280, 1281
—x. 58, 64, 664, 718, 1118, 1121, 1204, 1267
—xi. 32, 492, 955
—xii. 304, 307, 734, 756, 757, 897, 1090
Troubridge, Sir Thomas, x. 366
Tullamore, Lord, xii. 1414

Valletort, Lord, x. 720, 1069
—xi. 475
Venables, Mr. Alderman, ix. 139, 140, 141, 297, 300, 648, 702
—x. 222, 223, 471, 472, 580
—xii. 537, 894, 974
Vernon, Mr. Granville, ix. 1240, 1241, 1253
—x. 532
Vincent, Sir Francis, ix. 41, 939
—xii. 660
Vyvyan, Sir Richard, ix. 153, 192, 222, 224, 254, 304, 315, 337, 426, 591, 664, 744, 745, 746, 757, 1073, 1091, 1099, 1104, 1268, 1272, 1274, 1282
—x. 89, 96, 211, 245, 246, 247, 342, 635, 636, 693, 717, 1038, 1063, 1068, 1140, 1226, 1230
—xi. 129, 134, 237, 545, 882, 920
—xii. 1081, 1360, 1361, 1363

Waithman, Mr. Alderman, ix. 154, 155, 648, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1221
—x. 92, 195, 223, 331, 527, 582, 624, 703, 1065, 1086
—xi. 295, 296, 297, 1265
—xii. 782, 943, 984, 987, 1331
Walker, Mr., ix. 792
—x. 311, 598, 1061
—xi. 1151
—xii. 1426
Wall, Mr. Baring, ix. 475
Wallace, Mr. x. 323, 570, 578, 1349, 1351
—xi. 134, 970, 978, 1235
Walsh, Sir John, ix. 1012, 1014
Warburton, Mr., ix. 146, 149, 255, 300, 307, 308, 315, 326, 328, 330, 571, 572, 578, 584, 591, 694, 702, 781, 828, 1043, 1046, 1047, 1111, 1238, 1256, 1257, 1276, 1278, 1279
—x. 267, 325, 334, 339, 341, 385, 389, 390, 391, 392, 439, 509, 524, 535, 558, 559, 624, 836, 838, 1244, 1262
—xi. 296, 849, 928, 945, 967, 1277, 1280
—xii. 194, 310, 311, 312, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 321, 322, 468, 485, 488, 494, 544, 664, 667, 668, 756, 890, 894, 903, 1038, 1355
Warre, Mr., xi. 239
Warrender, Sir George, ix. 145, 191, 563, 619, 634, 723, 1194
—xii. 654, 1186
Wason, Mr. Rigby, ix. 1240, 1267
—x. 60, 79, 80, 394, 395, 396, 714, 832, 834, 912, 1130
—xi. 664, 698, 709
—xii. 310, 314, 315, 319, 666, 897, 903, 1413
Wellesley, Mr. L. P., ix. 218, 222
—x. 714
—xi. 1375
—xii. 589, 978
Western, Mr., ix. 216, 221
—x. 62, 691
Wetherell, Sir Charles, ix. 57, 125, 196, 224, 340, 501, 562, 563, 666, 691, 746, 748, 756, 758, 762, 809, 813, 814, 818, 820, 1019, 1028, 1030, 1046, 1102, 1104, 1106, 1110, 1195, 1203, 1218, 1337
—x. 48, 50, 58, 65, 66, 76, 77, 80, 86, 96, 97, 174, 205, 218, 222, 223, 239, 240, 306, 331, 396, 397, 399, 426, 427, 430, 431, 433,

538, 565, 609, 623, 664, 701, 911, 913, 977, 1086, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1122, 1152, 1205, 1218, 1235, 1244, 1267
  —xi. 58, 85, 86, 87, 219, 221, 231, 410, 561, 568, 901, 922, 1064, 1239, 1367, 1392
  —xii. 311, 857, 864, 1154, 1162
Weyland, Mr. John, ix. 93, 255, 593, 711, 713, 728, 765, 767, 817, 902, 1007, 1098, 1233
  —x. 67, 69, 838, 1323
  —xi. 286, 946
  —xii. 313, 317, 756, 1412, 1413
Whitmore, Mr., ix. 1081
  —x. 505
  —xii. 1329, 1362
Wilbraham, Mr., ix. 992
  —x. 1027
  —xi. 395, 428
Wilde, Mr. Serjeant, ix. 816
  —x. 426
Wilks, Mr., ix. 156, 759, 761, 822
  —x. 688, 1063
  —xi. 33, 242, 293, 410, 851
  —xii. 194, 476, 483
Williams, Mr. John, xii. 1160
Williamson, Sir Hedworth, x. 1131
  —xii. 304
Willoughby, Sir Henry, ix. 458
  —x. 704, 706, 909, 1098
  —xi. 267
Wood, Mr. John, ix. 145, 146, 327, 1190
  —x. 105, 191, 197, 230, 441, 543, 664
  —xi. 204
  —xii. 734, 876, 1041
Wood, Colonel, ix. 493, 1011, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1126, 1242
  —x. 84, 89, 94, 96, 228, 239, 241, 243, 388, 401, 540, 541, 1124
  —xi. 206, 207, 232
Wood, Mr. Alderman, ix. 706
  —x. 80, 258, 583
  —xi. 34, 205, 242, 1112, 1276
  —xii. 312, 489, 537, 782, 893, 905
Wortley, Mr. Stuart, ix. 198, 205, 445, 698 821, 1009, 1025, 1102, 1244
  —x. 46, 47, 51, 78, 271, 1156, 1266
  —xi. 81, 413
Wrangham, Mr., ix. 821
  —x. 140, 667, 1155
  —xi. 82
  —xii. 471, 476, 880
Wrightson, Mr., x. 1319
Wrottesley, Sir John, ix. 1223
  —x. 335, 544
  —xi. 46, 53, 54, 57
  —xii. 1037
Wynn, Mr. Charles Williams, ix. 696, 819, 951, 1005, 1109, 1110, 1127, 1198, 1208, 1235, 1238
  —x. 429, 430, 437, 479, 500, 717, 720, 1078
  —xi. 223, 234, 1039, 1041
  —xii. 742, 976
Wyse, Mr., ix. 787
  —x. 263, 264, 414, 1114, 1189
  —xi. 975, 1006, 1116, 1141, 1183, 1273, 1367, 1392, 1393, 1396
  —xii. 81, 83

Yorke, Captain, ix. 810
  —x. 284, 374, 380, 381, 477
  —xi. 340, 1362
Young, Mr., x. 23
  —xi. 1014

FINIS.

T. C. Hansard, Printer,
32, Paternoster-row, London.